THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—APRIL, 1903—No. 110.

ATTITUDE OF MODERN PROTESTANTS TOWARDS THE VIRGINITY OF OUR BLESSED LADY.

IT is with sentiments of pride and joy that we look back to the International Congress assembled in honor of Mary at Freiburg in Switzerland, August 18-21, 1902. Representatives from all parts of the Christian world bore witness to the unity of Catholic faith in the privileges of the great Mother of God, and to the intensity of devotion and love to our powerful patroness at the divine mercy-seat. According to a reliable estimate, more than eighteen thousand persons took part in the solemn procession which formed part of the external ceremonies of the Congress.[1] And it is with sentiments of longing and hope that we look forward to the honors which are to be paid to Our Blessed Lady in Rome, during the course of the year 1904, the fiftieth anniversary of the solemn definition of the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception.[2] But our joy and our hope are at times mingled with curiosity; we wish to know what impression our veneration of and devotion to Mary make on the Protestant world. It is strange indeed that while Catholics make every effort to honor Mary's Immaculate Conception and her glorious Assumption into Heaven, our Protestant contemporaries should wage a deadly battle—deadly only to themselves—against Mary's perpetual virginity. But we must not anticipate; nor must we charge all Protestants with enmity to Mary. In order

[1] Cf. Études, Oct. 5, 1902, p. 22-35.
[2] Cf. Études, May 20, 1902, p. 433-42.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

to understand the Protestant position more clearly, and to value their tenets at their proper worth, we shall first present an outline of the views advocated by acknowledged Protestant leaders, and then critically examine the arguments advanced by their most recent writer. In the first part, we shall follow the lead of Father L. Fonck,[3] in the second we shall analyze the article "Mary" contributed by Professor Schmiedel to the Encyclopædia Biblica.[4]

I.

We trust that even now many Protestants agree with the reformer Œcolampadius[5] in regarding opposition to Mary as the certain mark of a reprobate condition of mind; we know that there are several Protestant scholars who still defend the virginity of Mary as valiantly as did the Swiss reformer J. H. Bullinger.[6] The eminent critic and scholar J. B. Lightfoot returns to the defense of this privilege of our Blessed Lady in several passages of his erudite works.[7] Paul Feine shows against Holtzmann that modern opponents of Mary's virginity read the gospels in the light of a preconceived hypothesis; they see in this doctrine a gradual development of the Christian conception of Mary's exalted position, although history leaves no room for such a doctrinal evolution, seeing that the account of the infancy must have been written at the latest between 60 and 70 A. D.[8] Alfred Plummer[9] agrees with C. F. Nösgen[10] in defending the authenticity and historical value of the gospel passages which refer to Mary's unspotted virginity. Alfred Resch[11] believes that if we compare the *Gospel of the Infancy* to a diamond set in rubies, the omis-

---

3 Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, IV., 1901, p. 649-677.

4 Vol. III., 1902.

5 "Numquam de me, ut in Domino confido, audietur, quasi averser Mariam, erga quam minus bene affici reprobatæ mentis certum existimem indicium" Œcolampadius, Sermo de laudando in Maria Deo; cf. Petr. Canisius, De Maria Virgine incomparabili, 1, 2; Ingolstadii, 1577, p. 16.

6 Oportuit singulari et perpetua virginitate et puritate omnium selectissima illustrem et esse et permanere, quae singulariter electa a Deo in sacrosanctum Filii sui thalamum et templum, mater erat omnium sanctissimi partus, Filii utique Dei aeterni, futura," J. H. Bullinger, Sermo de Beata Virgine Maria; cf. Petr. Canisius, De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei Genitrice sacrosancta, 1, 2, Ingolstadii, 1577, p. 16.

7 Essays on the work entitled Supernatural Religion, London, 1889, p. 235 f.; The Brethren of the Lord, in Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, London, 1892, p. 1-45; Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, London, 1892, p. 252-291.

8 Eine vorkanonische Uberlieferung des Lukas, Gotha, 1891, p. 27-30.

9 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke; International Commentary; Edinburgh, 1896, p. 6, 24.

10 Die Evangelien nach Matth., Mark und Lukas; Kurzgefasster Kommentar, München, 1897, p. 291 f.

11 Das Kindheitsevangelium nach Lukas und Matthæus, Leipzig, 1897, p. 327 f.

sion of the apparitions of angels would be equivalent to the removal of the rubies, but the denial of the virgin birth would be like the destruction of the diamond itself. K. Endemann, too, has raised his voice in protest against Zahn's late attack on the perpetuity of Mary's virginity, and declared himself in favor of the Catholic view of the mystery.[12]

It must be confessed, however, that most Protestant scholars no longer agree with the school represented by the foregoing writers. The modern school rejects to a great extent even the divinity of Christ, and denies therefore almost of necessity the virginity of His Blessed Mother. Hermann Usener[13] derives what he calls the legend of the virgin birth from pagan sources, seeing in it a Christian adaptation of certain parts of pagan mythology. H. J. Holtzmann[14] considers all the gospel passages which imply Mary's virginity as later interpolations. Joh. Hillmann[15] attempts to prove that the "redactor" is responsible for all the objectionable passages, i. e., for all the verses favoring Christ's miraculous conception and birth. Joh. Weiss,[16] though not favorably impressed with Hillmann's theory, feels quite certain that the Judæo-Christian source of the third gospel knew nothing of the virgin birth. Both Hillmann and Joh. Weiss, therefore, agree with Usener in tracing the account of the miracle back to mythological sources. Adolf Harnack[17] considers it as one of the most certain results of historical criticism that the words "born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary" formed no part of the original gospel teaching. P. Lobstein,[18] though he is either not acquainted or not satisfied with the work of some of his predecessors, applies the principles of not merely the higher but the highest criticism to what he calls the myth of the virgin birth. F. Kattenbusch believes the main critical difficulty can be removed by the omission of the few words "because I know not man."

Meanwhile, H. J. Holtzmann, dissatisfied with his former solution of the problem, proposed a new way of removing the objectionable passage in Lk. i. 34 f.;[19] but H. Weinel[20] pronounced Kattenbusch's

[12] Zur Frage über die Brüder des Herrn, in Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., ix., 1900, 833-865.

[13] Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen I.: Das Weihnachtsfest, Bonn, 1889.

[14] Hand-Commentar zum N. T., I., Freiburg, 1889, p. 31 f.

[15] Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas kritisch untersucht, in Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, xvii., 1891, p. 192-261.

[16] Bernh. Weiss und Lic. Joh. Weiss zu Luk. i., 34-39 in H. A. W. Meyer's Krit.—exeget. Kommentar über das N. T., Göttingen, 1892, p. 302, 305.

[17] Das Apostol. Glaubensbekenntniss, Berlin, 1892, p. 23 f.

[18] Die Lehre von der übernatürlichen Geburt Christi, Freiburg, 1896, p. 27, 33, 36.

[19] Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie I., Freiburg, 1897, p. 412 f.

[20] Die Auslegung des apostolischen Bekenntnisses von Kattenbusch und die neutestamentliche Forschung, in Zeitschr. für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, II., 1901, 37-39.

theory the best way out of the difficulty. But even with all this, Adolf Harnack did not consider the spuriousness of Lk. i. 34 f. sufficiently established; he therefore summarized his own proofs against the authenticity of the passage in a paper contributed to the *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*,[21] leaving it, however, doubtful whether the passage had been inserted by Luke himself or a later interpolator. Whatever effect Harnack's proofs may have produced on the circle of his own followers, they did not convince Adolf Hilgenfeld;[22] this independent critic assigns the *whole* account of the birth and infancy of Jesus[23] to a later recension of the third gospel, and objects most decidedly against the practice of treating the above shorter passages in the narrative as interpolations. Still, while this eminent scholar answers most of Harnack's arguments quite satisfactorily, he agrees with Harnack, and with Lobstein too, in deriving the so-called myth of the virgin birth from a false interpretation of Is. vii., 14, current in early Judæo-Christian circles.

Of late, Ludw. Conrady[24] has come to the conclusion that the history of the infancy has been derived from Egyptian mythology; he believes that it passed into our gospels through the medium of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, an apocryphal work written by a good-natured Christian poet in Alexandria, about 120 A. D. But Conrady found out to his sorrow that our professional higher critics are as averse to any theory that outrages common sense too much as they are impatient of any view which agrees too closely with the dictates of sound reason. Hence representatives of as different critical tendencies as Ernst von Dobschütz,[25] H. J. Holtzmann[26] and J. Hillmann[27] agree in disagreeing with Conrady's explanation of the account of the virgin birth. But the end is not yet. Theod. Zahn, of Erlangen, a scholar well known for his conservative tendencies,[28] and Professor F. A. C. Sieffert, of Bonn,[29] have refurbished the old weapon so often and so ineffectually wielded against Mary's perpetual virginity. They again appeal to the brethren of Jesus in order to show that Mary cannot have remained a virgin at least after giving birth to our Lord.

---

21 II., 1901, 53-57.

22 Die Geburt Jesu aus der Jungfrau in dem Lukasevangelium, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theologie, xliv., 1901, p. 313-317.

23 Lk. i., 5—ii., 52.

24 Die Quelle der kanonischen Kindheitsgeschichte Jesus'; ein wissenschaftlicher Versuch; Göttingen, 1900.

25 Lit. Centralblatt, li., 1900, 2153 f.

26 Theol. Literaturztg., xxvi., 1901, 135-137.

27 Deutsche Litteraturztg., xxii., 1901, 1605-1607.

28 Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altchristlichen Literatur, vi., 2, Brüder und Vettern Jesu, p. 225-372; Leipzig, 1900.

29 Jacobus im N. T. in Realencycl. für prot. Theol. u. Kirche, 3 ed., viii., Leipzig, 1900.

It is clear from the foregoing list of writers and views, that we cannot in a paper like the present deal with all opponents of the virginity of our Blessed Lady. Some of them have been sufficiently refuted by such scholars as Professor O. Bardenhewer,[30] M. J. Lagrange[31] and L. Fonck.[32] And to slay the slain is not merely superfluous from an apologetic point of view, but also useless as far as the history of controversy is concerned; for the trend of argument is practically the same in all our opponents' writings on the present question. If we therefore examine into the argument of the most recent representative of the critical school, we shall at the same time analyze a fair specimen of the fallacies of higher criticism and become acquainted with a solid method of avoiding them.

II.

Professor Paul W. Schmiedel, of Zürich, has contributed to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*[33] an article on Mary. It consists of twenty-two paragraphs: the first two are devoted to a study of the name *Mary*, the last contains the bibliography of the subject, the three preceding the last treat of the life of Mary, of her character, and of the later traditions concerning her person and history, while the intermediate sixteen paragraphs treat of Mary's virginity. One has reason to feel surprised at the want of proportion in the make up of the article, but one is positively shocked at the contents of the closing portions. Among the later traditions, the scurrilous blasphemies of the Talmud and of Celsus seem to be placed on the same level with the sayings of St. Justin and St. Irenaeus. When describing the character of Mary the writer feels "on firm ground" only in the statement "that, at a time when many had already come to recognize the greatness of her Son's mission, Mary, at all events, had still failed to understand it." In the life of Mary, Dr. Schmiedel is certain of two points only: first, "that Mary, after the birth of her first-born son, became the mother of other sons and daughters;" secondly, "the only other absolutely authentic scene in Mary's life is that recorded in Mk. iii. 20 f., 31-35," passages in which the critic finds evidence of Mary's disbelief in the claims of her Son, and of her Son's grief over the attitude of His mother.

However briefly the foregoing views may be expressed by Pro-

---

[30] Zur Geschichte der Auslegung der Worte "Wie soll dies geschehen, da ich keinen Mann erkenne?" in Compte rendu du 4e Congrès scientif. internat. des Cathol. II., Fribourg, 1898, p. 13-22; Patrologie, ed. 2, Freiburg, 1901, p. 128; Lit. Rundschau, xxvii., 1901, 7-9.

[31] Revue biblique, ix., 1900, 619 f.

[32] Zeitschr. für katholische Theologie, iv., 1901, 649-677.

[33] III., 1902, cols. 2952-2969.

fessor Schmiedel, they clearly reveal the writer's view of the great Mother of God, and they thus prepare us for a due appreciation of the contents of the rest of his article. Here the Professor first examines the virgin birth successively in the light of the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, of Mark, of Luke, of the two genealogies, of Paul, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the Fourth Gospel, and of Matthew; next, he professes to state his results, but in reality he shows what is to be done with all the gospel passages which favor the virgin birth;[34] finally, the writer states his view as to the origin of the theory of the virgin birth, describes the value of the same, and points out other untenable items in the history of Christ's birth.

A glance at the method of Dr. Schmiedel's proceeding will throw considerable light on the value of his reasoning. It is agreed on all hands that an ambiguous and obscure passage of an author must be interpreted in the light of his clear and definite teaching. The Professor inverts this principle. He first considers a number of biblical passages that are either obscure or irrelevant as far as the mystery of the virgin birth is concerned; after explaining his own meaning into these, he corrects or explains away the passages which clearly and unmistakably contradict his preconceived views of the subject. But the reader has the right as well as the duty to judge for himself.

The critic's appeal to Christ's own testimony is really limited to two gospel texts. In Mt. xii. 28 Jesus declares that He casts out devils by the spirit of God; according to Mk. iii. 33 he asks "who is my mother, and who my brethren?" As evil fate will have it, Professor Schmiedel contributed the article "Gospels" to the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica;* in this[35] he admits only nine "absolutely credible passages," and neither of the foregoing two texts is among them. In other words, the critic has cut off the branch on which he now endeavors to rest. But even supposing that the number of the writer's "foundation pillars" be increased from nine to eleven, we still fail to see the connection between Christ's attributing His exorcisms to the spirit of God and His conviction that He has not been begotten by the spirit of God. Again, to infer from Christ's question "who is my mother, and who my brethren" His ignorance of His virgin birth betrays an utter misunderstanding of the words. Twisted into this meaning, they no longer exalt the faithful disciples above those favored by the highest gratuitous privileges, but they tend to lower Christ's unbelieving relatives below His stray followers.

But Mark's testimony may be more to the point. He tells us that

---

[34] Mt. i., 18-25; Lk. i., 34 f.; iii., 23; Mt. i. 16.
[35] Vol. II., col. 1881, n. 139 f.

Christ's "kinsmen went out to lay hold of him; for they said, he is beside himself;"[36] again, he has kept for us the words of Jesus "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house;"[37] moreover, he implies that Jesus first received the Holy Ghost at His baptism. Really, it requires more than common intelligence to see the connection between these three data and a denial or, at least, an ignoring of the virgin birth. If Professor Schmiedel could prove that if Jesus had been born of a virgin, He could not have first received the Holy Ghost at His baptism, and He must have been honored in His own country, among His own kin and in His own house, and His kinsmen could not have gone out to lay hold of Him, His appeal to the second evangelist might be valid. It might be valid, if the second evangelist really said or implied what the Professor reads into him. In point of fact, the gospel of Mark does not either say or imply that Jesus *first* received the Holy Ghost at the time of His baptism; He then received a greater plenitude of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Nor does the second evangelist urge the literal meaning of the proverb quoted by Jesus; no more than the third evangelist leads us to infer that Jesus was considered a physician, though he tells us that the saying "physician, heal thyself" was considered applicable to him. Nor again does Mark tell us that Christ's "kinsmen went out to lay hold of him;" the term rendered "kinsmen" by Dr. Schmiedel reads "friends" both in the Catholic version and the Revised. The Professor has no right to substitute "kinsmen" for "friends," since he does not prove the identity of the latter with those persons of whom Jesus said "who is my mother, and who my brethren?"[38]

In the next place, the critic asserts quite confidently that the second chapter of St. Luke "knows nothing of the virgin birth" and "rests upon the opposite presupposition;" he adds, moreover, that the two verses in the first chapter of the third gospel which contain the idea "clearly and effectively . . . disturb the connection so manifestly that we are compelled to regard them as a later insertion." We are fully conscious that a statement of the Professor's reasons for his double contention will prove dry and unpleasant. But at the risk of wearying the reader, we shall remain faithful to our method of doing full justice to all the arguments of our opponent.

In order to show that the second chapter of St. Luke implicitly denies the virgin birth, Dr. Schmiedel first appeals to the terms *father, mother,*[39] and *parents* of Jesus,[40] by which the evangelist desig-

[36] Mk. iii. 20 f.
[37] Mk. vi. 4.
[38] Mk. iii. 31 f.
[39] Lk. ii. 38, 48.
[40] Lk. ii. 27, 41, 43.

nates Joseph and Mary. Now, the Professor must be aware that the same terms are used in our days by devout Catholic writers in precisely the same meaning; unless we are to believe that all these modern scholars imply in their language a denial of the virgin birth, we fail to see why this inference should be derived from the language of St. Luke. Nor is the Professor's argument strengthened by the fact that Joseph and Mary marveled at the words of the shepherds and of Simeon,[41] and that they did not understand the words of the boy-Christ.[42] The knowledge of Mary's virginity did not necessarily turn the hearts of Joseph and Mary into moral icicles or endow their minds with the gift of a supernatural intuition. If our learned opponent knew more of the inner religious life, he would understand that even now many a pious soul, convinced though she be of Mary's perpetual virginity, still wonders at the various mysteries in our Lord's life, and feels quite puzzled over the hidden meaning of the words of our Divine Master.

But Professor Schmiedel adds an apparently more telling argument. The evangelist says[43] that "the days of *their* purification were fulfilled;" hence he believes that St. Joseph, too, had contracted the legal uncleanness, and that he was therefore the natural father of the child Jesus. We grant that the more probable reading substitutes "*their* purification" instead of "*her* purification." But if the text does contain any difficulty against the virgin birth, the latter reading is harder for us to answer than the former. Still, the solution is quite clear. It would have been out of the question for Mary to urge the privilege of her unspotted virginity against the injunction of the Mosaic law; if her Divine Son was not believed in spite of all the miracles He worked, how could the mother expect to find faith in her supernatural claims? Mary therefore had to accommodate herself to the practice of the Jewish mothers. And why then find fault with the evangelist for accommodating himself to the language of the same law in a passage in which he relates Mary's observance of the injunction? We stated above that the difficulty of the passage is lessened by the more probable reading "*their* purification," though Professor Schmiedel has failed to observe this. Our learned opponent is well aware that according to the law the Jewish father did not contract any legal uncleanness by the birth of his children; hence he believes that the evangelist's true reading "*their* purification" is "based upon an archæological error." It appears to us that the expression was chosen designedly; the evangelist knew that in the present case the mother had contracted no more uncleanness

[41] Lk. ii. 18 f., 33.
[42] Lk. ii. 50.
[43] Lk. ii. 22.

than the father; at the time he wrote, it was inexpedient to urge Mary's perpetual virginity in clear and open terms, owing to the blasphemous insinuations of the Jews. Hence he declared his own faith in Mary's prerogative implicitly, by placing her purification and therefore her legal uncleanness on the same level with Joseph's purification and uncleanness. In other words, St. Luke declared implicitly that Mary had contracted no legal stain, that she had remained an unspotted virgin.

Our foregoing conclusion is not contradicted by the phrase "with Mary his wife"[44] which the Professor endeavors to urge against us. This expression is precisely what we naturally expect to find in the passage that has scandalized Dr. Schmiedel. Joseph had married the Virgin Mary after the removal of his doubt related in the first chapter of the first gospel; about the time of Christ's birth therefore the third evangelist rightly calls Mary the wife of Joseph. Our opponent does not appear to realize that the readings "with Mary his spouse" and "with Mary his espoused wife," found in most Codices, create more difficulties to the defender of biblical inerrancy and of the honor of Mary than the reading on which he bases his exception.

Thus far we have considered Professor Schmiedel's attempted proof that the second chapter of the third gospel implicitly denies the virgin birth. Next, we pass on to the Professor's contention that the two passages in the first chapter of St. Luke which "clearly and effectively" relate the virgin birth must be later insertions. First then, according to our critic, the words "How shall this be done, because I know not man" are "on any assumption inappropriate." For the "act of concubitus" cannot be meant by the verb "I know not," seeing that it is in the present tense; in its general sense, the verb "would be quite meaningless in the present context;" finally, the "intermediate meaning" of the verb is excluded, since "the exact opposite is involved in the actual situation." Really, the Professor must find human society a grievous burden. If a friend tells him that he does not drink, the critical faculty of Dr. Schmiedel begins to rebel. "Drink being in the present tense, cannot refer to intoxicating liquor; it cannot have its general meaning, seeing that my friend has not died of thirst; any intermediate meaning is quite excluded by the actual situation. Clearly, my friend did not say I do not drink; my imagination has inserted the phrase." Professor Harnack agrees with Schmiedel in regarding the two verses in the first chapter of St. Luke, now under discussion, as a later insertion, but he candidly acknowledges that the present tense "I know not" points to the assumption of a perpetual virginity.[45]

[44] Lk. ii. 5.
[45] Zeitschr. für neut. Wissensch., II., 1901, 55.

Schmiedel's second proof for the later insertion of the verses now under discussion[46] assumes the following form: In answering Mary's question[47] the angel repeats, only more clearly, what he had said before the question was asked.[48] But before Mary asked her question, the angel spoke of "a fulfilment in the way of nature." Hence after Mary's interpolated question the angel only dilates upon the natural birth of an infant. We will not quarrel with the Professor about his first statement; it may be understood in a true and in a false sense. But we emphatically deny the critic's second or minor premise. Even if Mary could be shown to have understood the words as referring to the birth of an infant "in the way of nature," it would not follow that they really bore that meaning, unless we admit the principle that our words always mean what they are understood to mean by those we address. Feeling this weakness in his argument, the Professor begins to modify his former statement by the observation that the angelic words do not *necessarily* refer to a supernatural event. But even in this modified form the statement is not true of the angel's words taken in their context, though in this form the whole force of our opponent's argument is lost. Nor is the Professor more fortunate in his third observation that the notion of a supernatural birth "never at any time attached to the idea of the Jewish Messiah." This statement is quite irrelevant, unless it be supposed that the Old Testament contains a complete description of the person and the offices of the Redeemer, a supposition that is not only gratuitous but positively false. Besides, it is quite untrue that the Old Testament knows nothing of the virgin birth; the first evangelist expressly states that the virgin birth of Christ fulfills the well-known prophecy of Isaias:[49] "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel."

But Professor Schmiedel returns again to the fray. The son to be born of Mary, he argues, must be the son of David.[50] But, according to St. Luke, if we admit the virgin birth, Mary's son cannot be David's son. Hence the virgin birth cannot have been part of the original third gospel. We quite agree with the Professor's first or major premise, but we absolutely deny his second or minor statement. He wishes indeed to be generous, and therefore grants that "we are not in a position to say to what tribe it was that Mary really belonged;" still, he defends the thesis "that the author of Lk. i. held her to be a Levite is certain." And how does the Professor gain

[46] Lk. i. 34 f.
[47] Lk. i. 35.
[48] Lk. i. 30-33.
[49] vii. 14.
[50] Lk. i. 32.

this certainty? Why, the author of Lk. i. makes Mary a "kinswoman of Elizabeth,"[51] and represents Elizabeth as "a Levite."[52] Hence he held Mary to be "a Levite." Now, we confess that it is easy to get confused on genealogical puzzles, and we pardon Dr. Schmiedel beforehand any error into which he may unwittingly fall in this class of questions; but we do not forgive him his cock-sureness. Besides, we really believe that a little consideration on his part would have saved him from his rash conclusion. The evangelist may have known that the mother of Mary and the mother of Elizabeth were sisters. Both may have belonged to the tribe of Levi, though this is immaterial. Furthermore, the evangelist may have been aware that one married into the house of Aaron, and the other into the family of David. Hence he knew their respective daughters, Elizabeth and Mary, to be cousins, and he considered Elizabeth as belonging to the descendants of Aaron, and Mary as being of the family of David. Hence though the author of Lk. i. makes Mary a cousin of Elizabeth, and represents the latter as a Levite, he does not on that account necessarily consider Mary too as belonging to the priestly family.

Professor Schmiedel makes a last effort to prove that the verses in the first chapter of St. Luke's gospel which give evidence for the virgin birth are a later insertion. He believes that Mary's question, "how shall this be done?"[53] expresses a doubt as to the veracity of the angel's words; therefore, if it were genuine, Mary ought to have been punished for her doubt, just as Zacharias was punished for questioning the angel's veracity.[54] Now, apart from the fact that even in the records of Sacred Scripture the same kind of sin is not always represented as being visited by the same kind of punishment, in our present case we have not even the same sin to deal with. Zacharias doubted, and asked for a sign that he might believe; Mary did not doubt, but only expressed her wonder as to the manner in which the angel's words might be verified. Nor does the Professor's depreciation of the angel's argument[55] strengthen his case; he belittles it, because it concludes from what is less wonderful to what is more wonderful, from Elizabeth's conception in her old age to Mary's virgin birth. As if every argument ought to proceed "a maiore ad minus" in order to be conclusive; the opposite method is recognized as equally legitimate by professional logicians. The parting observation of Dr. Schmiedel that the Greek word ἐπεὶ does not occur elsewhere in the third gospel or in Acts is of little

[51] Lk. i. 36.
[52] Lk. i. 5.
[53] Lk. i. 34 f.
[54] Lk. i. 20.
[55] Lk. i. 36.

importance. The same word occurs only once in the second gospel,[56] and still we cannot infer from this fact that the clause it introduces is spurious. Moreover, the composite expression ἐπεὶ δὲ or ἐπειδὴ is found elsewhere both in the third gospel and in Acts.[57]

In the next place, Professor Schmiedel considers the testimony of the two genealogies of Christ found respectively in the first and the third gospel.[58] We do not here intend to inquire whether the view of those commentators is correct who refer one of these genealogies to Mary and the other to Joseph; but we maintain that Schmiedel's main argument for rejecting this view is wrong. For it is based on the contention that according to the third evangelist[59] Mary belongs to the tribe of Levi, a statement that has not been and cannot be proved from the text of the third gospel. The Professor's next observation is more to the point: Even if only one genealogy refers to Joseph, it shows that Joseph was considered the natural father of Jesus, and therefore excludes the virgin birth. But the argument is more specious than conclusive. Two considerations have already been pointed out which bear to a certain extent on our question. First, the whole body of Catholics refers at least one of the genealogies to St. Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, without thereby denying the perpetual virginity of our Blessed Lady; can we not suppose, therefore, that the evangelists understood the genealogies in the way in which later Christians interpreted them? Secondly, during the course of the first century there existed good and valid reasons for not divulging the mystery of the virgin birth promiscuously; what wonder, therefore, if the evangelists wrote in such a way as to instruct the initiated Christians without furnishing matter for blasphemy to the enemies of the Church? To these two considerations we may now add a third one: According to an ancient tradition Mary was an heiress and had, therefore, to marry within her own tribe, so that for all those who were acquainted with these particulars the Davidic descent of Joseph implied her own extraction from the tribe of Juda. Since the first and the third gospels exhibit genealogical tables that had originally served in Jewish circles, they naturally presuppose an acquaintance with these data regarded almost as first principles by Hebrew readers. Hence there is no inconsistency on the part of Matthew and Luke, if after giving Joseph's genealogy they deny that Joseph was the natural father of Jesus.[60]

We must confess that we have been tempted more than once to

[56] Mk. xv. 42.
[57] Lk. vii. 1; Acts xiii. 46.
[58] Mt. i. 1-17; Lk. iii. 23-38.
[59] Lk. i. 36.
[60] Mt. i. 16; Lk. iii. 23.

break off our analysis of Schmiedel's proofs for his view that the earliest New Testament records know nothing of the virgin birth. They are but a tissue of false premises and illegitimate conclusions. But seeing that only a few more witnesses remain to be heard, we shall for the sake of completeness continue our wearisome task even to the end. Professor Schmiedel's next point of evidence is taken from the writings of St. Paul. He believes the apostle's statement[61] "that Jesus was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, is irreconcilable with his virgin birth." He does not understand why reference has not been made "to the share which the Holy Ghost . . . had in his generation." In a similar way, the Professor might infer from the next verse that God the Father did not beget His Son from all eternity. Or does not the apostle say that Jesus Christ "was predestinated the Son of God . . . by the resurrection . . . from the dead?" The share which God the Father had in the eternal generation is not mentioned. Thus far we have added only a new puzzle to Schmiedel's exception; but we can go a step further, and produce light out of twofold darkness. The Greek term rendered in our version "was predestinated" really means "was declared." The apostle, therefore, tells us that Jesus Christ was declared, or shown, to be the Son of God, or true God, by His resurrection from the dead; and similarly He was made known to be true man by His descent from David. The mention of the Father as the principle of the divine generation, and of the Holy Ghost as the sharer in the human generation of Jesus Christ would have rendered the passage of St. Paul too obscure.

But the critic has not yet done with St. Paul; does he not say[62] that God sends forth His Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh?" And "since the apostle in Rom. v. 12 traces the sinfulness of mankind to its descent from Adam, such a statement would certainly be impossible, the virgin birth being held." Perhaps we might be able to answer the foregoing difficulty by determining the limits of God's power, by inquiring whether a human being conceived by the Holy Ghost can be born in original sin. But happily our present case does not require such deep investigations. For, in the first place, the Professor changes his middle term: in the major premise it is "the likeness of sinful flesh," in the minor premise it becomes "sinfulness of mankind." Secondly, the Professor misinterprets the Greek phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι; instead of representing Jesus as robed in flesh, which *looked like* sinful flesh, "in the appearance of sinful flesh," he implies that Jesus had really contracted the sinfulness of human flesh.

---

[61] Rom. i. 3.
[62] Rom. viii. 3.

"The most important passage, however," Dr. Schmiedel tells us in the next place, "is found in Gal. iv. 4." The entire verse reads: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Now, the critic does not wish to build his argument on the phrase "made of a woman; for after all, a virgin is also a woman." But he appeals to the context "born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law;" hence, he argues, it is shown "that in order to become their redeemer it behooved Jesus to be completely like those He came to redeem." The simple rules of Dialectics show here that the Professor's conclusion is wider than his premises. At best it follows, and even this does not follow, "that in order to become their redeemer it behooved Jesus to be completely" under the law "like those He came to redeem." But from this hypothetic conclusion it is quite impossible to infer the further conclusion "thus also the phrase 'born of a woman' denotes a birth differing in no essential particular from ordinary human births." It is quite impossible to arrive at this further conclusion from the foregoing data, first, because the middle term of the new argument "to be completely under the law" does not necessarily imply "a birth differing in no particular from ordinary human births;" secondly, because this latter expression is in its turn quite different from the phrase "born of a woman," so that the most favorable inference the Professor might have drawn from his premises, if he had manipulated them properly, would read "thus also the phrase 'born of a woman' denotes a birth differing in no essential particular" from the giving birth of women. But on the one hand, this last conclusion is verified in our Lord's birth, and on the other, it does not exclude the virgin birth. Apart from all artificial inferences, St. Paul's expression "born of a woman" may not be sufficient to establish the mystery of the virgin birth, but it admirably agrees with this mystery, if we suppose that the apostle believed in it.

Professor Schmiedel's last observation concerning St. Paul's view on the virgin birth appears to have been regarded as of inferior value by the writer himself; for it is added to the preceding remarks in smaller type. It may be formulated in this way: Paul is "the first to formulate . . . the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus. . . . If, however, the doctrine of the virgin birth had been handed down to him, he would hardly have framed a doctrine of the pre-existent state." We need not expressly add the conclusion of this argument, since with all due respect to Professor Schmiedel we feel bound to deny both his premises. The writer himself has his doubts as to the truth of the major premise; hence he adds rather naively "unless indeed one were to regard the utterances of the Johannine Christ

regarding his pre-existence as historical." As to the minor premise, too, the Professor has his misgivings; hence he wishes his readers to believe that the doctrine of the pre-existent state is "hard to reconcile with such a tradition (of the virgin birth) received from the original apostles." Needless to say that we admit the utterances of the Johannine Christ as historical, and that we do not see any special difficulty in reconciling the pre-existence of the person of Christ with His *virgin* birth; the difficulty touches rather His *human* birth, and His birth in time.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has proved rather barren in exceptions to the virgin birth. Professor Schmiedel only argues that according to Hebr. vii. 14 "our Lord sprang out of Judah;" hence "for all who find themselves compelled to believe that Luke rightly attributes a Levitical descent to Mary, Hebr. vii. 14 testifies unquestionably and with emphasis against the doctrine of the virgin birth." Now, we are in the happy position of not finding ourselves compelled to believe that *Luke is right* in making Mary "a Levite;" for we have already shown that Luke does not make Mary a Levite at all.

The Fourth Gospel affords again a wider field of exploitation, though the Professor himself confesses that, owing to the fourth evangelist's clear doctrine concerning the eternal existence of the Logos, the mystery of the virgin birth must have been of less importance in his eyes. Still, he believes that it would have been important for Jesus Christ to be able to say that He had been "born in an altogether exceptional way." Here the Professor does not appear to notice his anachronism; he speaks as if the future record of John might have rendered it possible or impossible for Jesus to appeal to His virgin birth. But apart from this oversight, the Professor does not seem to realize that Christ's virgin birth was hardly a sign which He could appeal to; it was rather a mystery that had to be believed on Christ's authority, and had to be confirmed by miracles. Hence we cannot be astonished that Philip[63] in his early intercourse with the Master, and the Jews[64] call Jesus the son of Joseph. The additional remark of the Professor that Nazareth is spoken of as Jesus' birthplace[65] does not influence the fact of the virgin birth.

It is rather amusing to read in the critic's next paragraph: "No direct polemic, however, against the virgin birth of Jesus can be discovered in Jn. i. 13." We need not repeat the Professor's argument by which he proves the foregoing statement; but we must

[63] Jn. i. 45.
[64] Jn. vi. 42.
[65] Jn. i. 45; vii. 41 f., 52.

direct attention to his smooth method of avoiding the argument in favor of Christ's virgin birth which can be based on the passage[66] in which he adroitly discovers no polemic against the virgin birth. According to Resch,[67] the Johannine passage now under consideration most explicitly denies that Jesus was conceived by the intervention of a human father.

Still, Professor Schmiedel is not as yet satisfied with himself nor with the Fourth Gospel. "Nevertheless," he says, "it is not impossible that the Fourth Gospel contains a tacit rejection of the doctrine in question." Surely, a most ingenious way out of difficulties. And here is the ground on which the writer's supposition is based. "If only we may suppose that he (the Fourth Evangelist) knew it (the current doctrine of the virgin birth) it would be quite in accordance with the spirit of its (the Fourth Gospel's) author if the doctrine appeared to him too slight and too external for the Logos." On our part, we feel fully convinced that the evangelist knew the mystery of the virgin birth, though our conviction is not the result of the Professor's proof; but we are equally convinced that the virgin disciple did not regard Mary's virginity in the light suggested by Professor Schmiedel. If the Fourth Gospel tacitly rejects anything that touches the question of the virgin birth, it surely is the Professor's view of the case.

Finally Dr. Schmiedel invites us to consider "it antecedently probable that from Matthew as well as from Luke the theory of the virgin birth of Jesus was originally absent." His proofs are of the same kind as those we have thus far considered. It is therefore antecedently probable that they are not conclusive. First, he brings up the words "Is not this the carpenter's son?"[68] spoken by the unbelieving citizens of Christ's own country, though the evangelist does not endorse this saying. But we can hardly believe that the Professor is really serious in this part of his argumentation. He cannot be fully in earnest, when he argues that the second chapter of the first gospel "admits of a complete understanding without the presupposition of the virgin birth," and that the account of the virginal conception of the child in the first chapter[69] "thus appears not only to be later than chap. 2, but also to have been somewhat heedlessly introduced." Here we have certainly a new method of arguing which proves anything and therefore nothing. The third chapter can be fully understood without the second chapter; therefore the second chapter is later than the third. Clearly, even higher criti-

[66] Jn. i. 13.
[67] Das Kindheitsevangelium, Leipzig, 1897, p. 249 f.
[68] Mt. xiii. 55.
[69] Mt. i. 18-25.

cism must retain some appearance of reasonableness, if it does not wish to lose all credit.

Thus far we have followed Professor Schmiedel in his study of the various New Testament sources which bear more or less *indirectly* on the virgin birth. We shall now briefly state the Professor's opinion on the four passages which testify *clearly* and *directly* in favor of our Blessed Lady's virginity. They are: 1. St. Matthew's account of Joseph's doubt concerning our Blessed Lady, of the removal of this doubt by the intervention of an angel, and of the formal marriage of Joseph and Mary;[70] 2. St. Luke's relation of Mary's question "How shall this be done?" and of the angel's answer;[71] 3. The last verse in St. Matthew's genealogy of Jesus: "And Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ;"[72] 4. The phrase "as it was supposed" found in the beginning of St. Luke's genealogy of Jesus. After the preceding investigation, Dr. Schmiedel considers himself "in a position to sum up and complete the results arrived at." His sweeping verdict is that all of these four passages are later insertions. There is only this difference between them, that the first two were inserted on their own account, while the last two were inserted to harmonize the existing genealogies of the first and third gospels with the first two interpolations.

No honest textual critic has ever doubted about the genuineness of the first two passages, or of the phrase "as it was supposed" in the third gospel. All editions of the sacred text from the Erasmian down to those issued by Tischendorf, Nestle, Westcott and Hort, B. Weiss, Brandscheid, and other modern scholars of standing, retain the foregoing texts without the slightest indication of doubt as to their genuineness. It is not, therefore, external authority that induces Professor Schmiedel to adopt his radical method of destruction. The state of the case is as follows: Professor Schmiedel's prejudice has prompted him to explain into a number of texts what they do not contain, and to explain away the real meaning of another series of texts; after this he is brought face to face with texts which are too clear to be explained away or to be twisted so as to agree with his preconceived ideas. So much the worse for the texts: Professor Schmiedel is right, as a matter of course, and the gospels are wrong.

One of the four passages, which we enumerated as bearing directly on the virgin birth, happens to exhibit a variety of readings in different sources. It is here that Professor Schmiedel's ingenuity

---

[70] Mt. i. 18-25.
[71] Lk. i. 34 f.
[72] Mt. i. 16.

reaches the height of absurdity. In the "*Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*," edited by Conybeare,[73] we find the reading: "Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ, and Joseph begot Jesus who is called Christ." Now in the first place, Conybeare's edition rests on the authority of only one Codex of the twelfth century; for a textual critic it is simply out of the question to compare a twelfth century reading with a reading of the fourth or fifth century, and much less can he prefer the former to the latter. In the second place, a textual critic must take the reading as his Codex gives it, or else not appeal to his Codex at all. But, however plain and elementary these principles may appear to be, they are simply ignored by Professor Schmiedel. He first bravely tells us that the "original text" of Mt. i. 16 "was first actually discovered in the '*Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila.*'" In the same breath he adds that the original text reads "and Joseph begot Jesus," the words "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ" being omitted. In other words, the critic professes to regard a twelfth century reading preferable to the text of the great fourth and fifth century Codices; but in spite of his plain words, he substitutes a reading of his own make instead of the promised twelfth century text.

We shall not weary the reader with the Professor's imaginary process of evolution that has resulted in our present text of Mt. i. 16. All through, the principles of textual criticism are simply set aside; there is no authority except the wish of Professor Schmiedel, and he is infallible. While he hardly produces a single argument that really concludes, some of his reasonings are positively comical when they are divested of their learned varnish. "As soon as we have satisfied ourselves," the Professor writes, "how neither Jesus, nor his mother, nor Mark, nor the author of Mt. iii.-xxviii. or of Lk. iii.-xxiv., nor yet the authors of Lk. ii. or of i. 5-33, 36-80 or of Mt. i. 1-19 or of chapt. ii. were acquainted with the virgin birth, it were indeed too absurd an anachronism to attribute to falsification by a sect the fact that in Mt. i. 16 Joseph figures as the father of Jesus." In other words: The virgin birth is not mentioned in the gospels except where it is mentioned. Therefore the singular and rare reading which makes Joseph the father of Jesus cannot be due to a falsification by heretics. Truly, a very convenient form of argument. The divinity of Christ is not mentioned in the gospels except in the passages in which it is mentioned; therefore Christ is not God according to Sacred Scripture. Again, Professor Schmiedel has not contributed anything to the *Encyclopædia Biblica* except what he has contributed. Therefore he has contributed nothing at all.

[73] Anecd. Oxon. Class. ser. 8, 1898, p. 76.

The reader has no doubt felt convinced before this that in his treatment of Mary's virginity Professor Schmiedel cares little for common sense and solid reason and truth; but he does care a great deal for novelty and the infallibility of Professor Schmiedel. It is needless to say that reason and truth are preferable to novelty and Schmiedel.

A. J. Maas, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

REFORM AND REFORMERS.

SOCIAL Reform has become such an important feature of modern life that it is regarded as the most vital problem that confronts society to-day. It has created a strong and dignified literature which effectively teaches this, and it has created a class of Reformers, which certainly merits a hearing. Scholarship, Literature, Politics have contributed able men to the cause, and they have added greatly to its force, though in fact these are outnumbered, outvoiced and outwritten by the less creditable believers who add only enthusiasm and numbers to the movement.

In spite of the strength, dignity and essential rightness in Reform, it meets serious, even stern opposition. It is looked upon as a menace, its gospel repudiated as a dream and its apostles ostracized as enemies of public order. There is as much reality, earnestness and zeal with reform, as against it; surely as much historical vindication of it as of condemnation for it. Looking closely at the situation one finds that the usual happens; that as in the case with most contentions touching human interests, right and wrong, understanding and misunderstanding, merited and unmerited criticism abound on both sides. The objective situation as a fact is confused with the subjective estimate of facts, partial views parade as complete ones and personality and principle are often confused. The partisan is not fair; the non-partisan has no standing. One must be Reformer or Conservative and adopt the language, spirit and methods of his party, or be ruled out.

Interesting as is every phase of the great question, the subjective view of the Reformer seems to be particularly so. Once we know him sympathetically, we understand how much he represents, and how natural is the process which produces him. Such a study is here attempted. After a brief glance at the psychological conditions out of which Conservatism and Reform appear in society, as

general antagonistic tendencies, the Reform spirit, the Reformer and the Reform Party are described on the subjective side. Such a view is necessarily incomplete, but it may possibly not be without its uses.

The phrase Social Reform is employed in so many senses that it is difficult for one to fix a meaning to which one can remain faithful even in one's thinking. Any given social group aiming at a fixed purpose, usually devises ways and means called institutions by which the purpose is worked out. In the event that results show complete or partial failure in the institutions or methods, if the group possess any ambition, it will strive to correct the faults which hinder success. This effort will be called reform effort. In this sense, we speak of educational reform, tariff reform; the reform of the constitution of an art club, of a secret society or of a labor union. Hence reform effort is a general social phenomenon. Two currents of activity will be noticed; the normal movement in achieving results and the reforming effort, as secondary, and accidental.

The unification of human society, solidarity among its members, the development of contact, communication, language, trade and law, have gradually led us into the habit of thinking of society itself as one vast group, nation by nation, possessing unity of purpose, of institutions and methods for its realization. We think, therefore, of social progress as one—social questions or evils as one—social reform as one; merely enlarging into a complex field, the simple view just referred to. Modern society rests practically on an economic basis; industrial society is the determining element to-day. One's religion, culture, education, even one's ethical and esthetic development are largely determined by one's possession of or control of wealth. Our political ambition, social standards, virtues and vices are likewise largely affected by it. Our economic life is individualistic; the majority of our people, wage earners. The wages question is therefore the primary social question. It is customary for many if not all reformers to group all questions of intemperance, immorality, ignorance, private and public dishonesty around the economic phase of life. Thus Social Reform, while in itself a general sociological phenomenon, has primarily to do with economic reform, and through it, with all life and its problems. Sanz Y. Escartin in L'Individu et la Reforme Sociale (French ed. by Dietrich, page 21) says that social reform consists in the equitable distribution of the goods of this world, not only of riches but also and above all, in morality, health, knowledge, the enjoyment of art and nature, in family and dignity. And Hobson in his sketch of Ruskin as a Reformer (p. 29) uses the term in its broad sense "to describe those larger changes in the structure or working of society which aim

directly at some general improvement of human life, as distinguished from such work of reform as attacks narrower and more specific defects." As the term tends to establish itself in the mind of the typical, general reformer, it assumes a fairly definite meaning. His aim is universal peace, culture, justice, happiness. Present institutions are impotent to secure it; he desires a readjustment of society, which promises the realization of his cherished hope. The degree to which reformers surrender to this hope and the methods to which they resort in attempts to realize it, differentiate them fairly well among themselves, and distinguish them too, broadly from those whom we do not call reformers.

All men are to an extent reformers; they unite in their remote ideals and in admitting the limitations of life, the need of constant readjustment of situations and institutions. The most determined conservative will not resent all efforts at reform. He merely has his peculiar views of what is needed, of what is possible and advisable. One class is inclined to be slow in change, slow in seeing reasons for it, cautious in making it. Such men assert belief in the power of the individual to rise when he wills. We have in this class a uniform spirit, similar conditions among members, and every degree of faith in the goodness of things as they are. Here we find Conservatism. Another class is quick to see reasons for change, reckless in making it, inclined to emphasize the reasons for it. Such men assert that the individual cannot rise when he wills, unless institutions be improved. We have then every variety of temperament, discretion, aim and method from extreme radical to mild conservative. Here we find Radicalism, or Reform. Possibly, in the course of the study, this thought will emerge more clearly.

Reform effort is a permanent phenomenon in human history. There is no time, no nation without it nor is progress in any form of social life free from obligations to it. To-day there is scarcely an institution which does not in some way manifest such effort. The press and literature are filled with information about social and political reform, dress and ballot reform, educational and tax reform, asylum and church reform, charity and tariff reform, judicial and medical reform. Commissions are created to investigate and report, experiments are everywhere proposed or made; some attack and some defend innovation; there is no escape, for as Emerson once said, the demon of reform is everywhere. Brice in an interesting study on "An Age of Discontent," in the Contemporary Review (vol. 59) attempts to show that the unrest which we notice is quite peculiar to our time. But it is probably not distinctive except in accidental features. Need of reform, effort for it and opposition to it are practically constant in history.

Men are finite in purpose, in capacity and achievement. They are never as good as the goodness that they know, they are nearly always inclined to be contented with conditions which in some way fall short of what they might wish. The institutions which individuals create reveal the same truth. Society is never as good as the goodness which it knows, never as perfect as the perfection that it sees; it easily tolerates conditions which are far below its philosophy and ideals. The margin between what society knows and what it is, makes reform effort possible, even inevitable. A society absolutely contented with itself could manifest no reform movement; one which is as good and perfect as its advanced knowledge, needs no reform; one with no knowledge of anything better than it is, desires none. Knowledge of the better stirs to discontent. Our discontent to-day, with charity work, methods of taxation, industrial methods, educational work and the like, is due to the appreciation of defects and to the knowledge of more perfect methods which we wish to see adopted.

When one attempts to isolate the phenomenon of reform, one is inclined to think that the world never before saw such a feverish desire for it as we now behold. We doubt the value of religious liberty, of political liberty, of industrial liberty; we think of times when limited liberty seemed to insure more nobility, less education meant more comfort, fewer rights meant more justice and narrow life gave greater peace. And so, contact, communication of thought, travel and the press, social solidarity have distributed the spirit of discontent to the point where any individual may share the discontent of everyone—and reform may become paramount to him. An advance made anywhere in society, affects society as a whole; progress in psychology affects education, theology, medicine and philosophy. Thought is constantly advancing. The better that we know is constantly growing better while the institutions which control our living, move slowly when they do not fail. Thought rarely falls below its highest level; institutions do always; thus the prospect of reform is permanent. It will generally spring from similar situations, no matter in what department of social life. There will be reform and anti-reform; some tenacious of what is, others eager for what might be; the favorites of a situation against its victims; the old against the new, the acknowledged imperfect against the alleged perfect. The history of industry, of law, of education, of finance, furnishes abundant illustration.

If reform is a permanent phenomenon in the history of social institutions, it takes a place very near to progress, and it merits a reputation which it, in fact, does not enjoy. In the nature of the case, it will be, as a rule, of lowly origin; cranks and freaks may and do

attach themselves to it; men of limited attainments and pronounced egotism, of questioned sanity and intemperate speech, who dream and scold and wear ill-fitting clothes, yet, even they perform a service to the cause, as was wisely remarked by Brice in the article referred to. "It is one of the merits of democracy that it produces the crank and deals leniently with him. He is one of the voices of dissent and dissatisfaction, not useless even when he preaches some old fallacy, for he obliges us to refute him but eminently useful when he has got hold of a fragment of a forgotten or only half discovered truth." Unfortunately, public opinion seems to be ignorant of this; it misjudges reform by estimating its worst representatives alone, and condemns it before hearing a defense.

It might be well if we had a better knowledge of its constitution, its psychological elements and its deeper relation to the whole process of life. Whether or not we give it sympathy, we should at least give it justice. As social reform is the most prominent phase of reform in the public mind to-day, attention is directed largely to it in this study.

The thinking of to-day is a wonderful phenomenon. Its utter abandon, irresponsibility and seeming lack of purpose; facility of publication and of sale of books and papers, have given it a momentum that is remarkable. Good thinking and poor thinking abound, though the demand is as much for freedom of research as for truth. As regards social thinking, there is not much question about how much of the new thought our institutions can absorb; little concern about possible dangers to our social structure in theories carelessly advanced. The watchword is—think, speculate, publish, sell. "The genius of the day does not incline to a deed, but to a beholding." Emerson's remark is as true now as when he wrote it. We have bales and bales of thought tied neatly by the strings of logic, and counted as part of our social wealth, useless largely, because our institutions cannot be adjusted to it. We are behind the thinking of the French Revolution in our own institutions, to-day. This eagerness to think and failure to think to a purpose have misled us into caring too much for correctness of thought and too little for correctness of life. We have numberless books telling us about human rights, liberty, fraternity and happiness, all models of logic, written possibly long after suffering men and women and children had proclaimed these truths on the pages of life. The facts of crime, arrested development, blameless misery and needless suffering, seem to concern us less than definition and argument. We have no statistics to show the numbers of laborers to whom the right of union is denied in fact while we have many books and laws showing that they may exercise it; no tables showing the numbers

who do enjoy and the numbers who do not enjoy, reasonable opportunity of culture, happiness and home, while we have abundant volumes showing that men and women have the right to such enjoyment. Were we wiser, did we aim to work into realization, a fraction of the rights about which we write and teach, history would be far less sad and life would bring more joy. We go to a tailor not for cloth but for clothes; to a shoemaker not for leather but for shoes; in either case, the material is cut to fit, and made to meet a need. Men require, not abstract liberty so much as moderate liberty, cut to fit. The amazing incongruity to which this condition has led us is seen in the fact that the nation tells us whether or not a soldier returning from the Philippine Islands may bring with him rings free of duty, while it stands paralyzed for five months, helpless in the coal strike which was a national calamity. Whether or not human progress requires this great activity of thought is of course not in question; the fact is stated as one which may aid us to understand reform activity.

This high plane of social thinking has given us very high social ideals. Everyone is to-day more or less educated, more or less susceptible to the charm of the ideal. Many have been fascinated by it; they believe in it, believe that perfection is possible; they accept liberty, equality, fraternity as axioms, self-evident. They study the mocking failures of institutions, demand improvement—the uplifting of institutions to the plane of the ideal. Knowledge of the better stirs to discontent and Reform is born. Ranging from the extreme of anarchy down through its various forms to socialism; through its forms down to the labor movement, and down through its various phases, we have every degree of discontent and idealism. The anarchist is totally an idealist; the labor leader, moderately so; the former misses the limitations of the real, the latter reckons them to some extent. Summed up, however, the movement in all phases results from the advance of thought, over the achievements of our institutions.

All institutions seem to an extent, to fail. Were any institution to meet its purpose perfectly, at a given time, failure would soon appear, through the shifting of life. The psychological inertia of institutions as well as their rigidity hinders them from changing quickly enough to anticipate problems. While institutions rarely accomplish all that is aimed at, they nevertheless accomplish much. It is not too much to say that they are identical with civilization. Many are impressed deeply by what our institutions have achieved, and but little by what they have failed to do. They see the splendid picture of widening appreciation of human dignity and rights as it appears in history, of the triumphs over ignorance and barbarism

which constitute the glory of the race. The many who take a view like this, therefore, are champions of what is. They compare it with what has been, and declare themselves content. Order and peace, security of life and property, education, progress, individual development, all such features of society give them inspiration. They are satisfied with the real; the ideal does not appeal to them so strongly. When institutions are not questioned or conditions not attacked, their apologists and friends remain quiet and unconcerned. But when Reform appears, challenges everything or anything, and advocates ideals, the friends of institutions assert themselves and make defense. Then Conservatism is born. Nature thus brings face to face, conservative and reformer as types of social processes, both necessary and each an obstacle, both narrow, intolerant, impatient. Out of the conflict of the two tendencies comes much of the elevation of the race, which we call progress.

The composition of the conservative class may be outlined easily. The favored of fortune, who in the present individualistic condition, possess wealth, power or position; they who are strong and self-reliant, who have "the sense of established facts," who by nature are cautious, matter of fact or optimistic. Our present day civilization rests on the institution of property and the principles of individualism. Conservatism is their defender, while Reform is always aggressive. The lazy, careless, ignorant, in society; men who are utterly devoid of ambition or aspiration give some strength to conservatism. It has the influence of establishment, of press, literature, religion, government; and is admirably equipped in every way for self defense.

The spirit of conservatism is traditional; it insists on the limitations of man and forgets his possibilities. It sees social processes clearly and is cautious to the point of inaction. It is diplomatic, ready to compromise when an opponent obstructs its path, because it is less devoted to principle than to fact. It is prepared to be honest as far as honesty pays, but it is not incapable of dishonesty to win its purpose. By the nature of the case, it is well educated, correct in conduct, well dressed, cultured. Its mistakes of inaction are not easily calculated, hence it is not introspective, self critical. Its principle is "Let well enough alone." Finding things fairly good, it resists any attempt to better them. "Le bien, c'est l'ennemi du mieux." The solid and essential honesty of conservatism's main motive cannot be questioned, but its claim to entire honesty may well be doubted. It includes, in its circle, every variety of motive and personality from the "somnolent respectability" of one to the generous sincere consecration of another to the welfare of society. It has worthy and unworthy representatives, good and bad methods,

wise and unwise policies, virtues and vices. It is not necessarily opposed to all change but is predisposed against much of it. There is in it a tendency to selfishness because it begins by devotion to institutions, gradually shifts to devotion to self, becomes selfish psychologically and aims to maintain itself against opposition, independently of the rightness of its claims.

Conservatism is consequently all powerful, the inertia of institutions favors it; ignorance and indifference in the masses strengthen it; self interest, fear of change add to its power; the greatest in government, highest in religion, and most cultured in education are apt to be at its service. Thus constituted, it is the protection of civilization, the security of progress, though too, at times a hindrance and a check to both. Its inherent tendency is to stagnation, inaction, but as a rule not allowed to remain unopposed. Whenever it endangers progress, reform appears; irrespressible, eloquent, appealing, it forces movement and protects society. This is true of society at large, true also of every social group, stable enough to give rise to the two tendencies. Conservatism and Reform in education, in government, in taxation, science, religion, everywhere are the product of the same law, are essentially alike, perform practically the same function, and reveal the same wonderful process of advance without danger, and caution without delay, which the course of history reveals.

Conservatism is the philosophy of those who are content with given conditions; Reform, the philosophy of those who accept advanced thought and aim to force the situation to adjustment. Conservatism recoils from the "exorbitant idea," reform recoils from the "dwarfish actual." An orator at the Buffalo Reform convention July, 1899, used this picturesque figure to express the relation of the two: "Every foot of land, every pound of product, every hearthstone, every purse is found insulated with conservatism and timidity when touched by the current of radicalism."

Reform is protest and aspiration. Attached to the ideal, it is discontented with the real; and it even fails to see or seeing, to admit the good that the actual possesses. "Le mieux, c'est l'ennemi du bien." We may then venture to name those who are apt to become reformers. Many will come from among those who study and love the ideal, who write and think about typical perfection; whose sense of the beautiful is professedly cultivated; hence, many poets, artists, and men of letters. Ruskin was made a reformer of the intense type, by recognizing the relation of art and national character, and Morris is the greatest modern teacher of the reform ideal. To all such the ugly mechanical features of life are repulsive; they detest a locomotive and like clouds; loathe business and love

dreams. The imperfections of life and institutions are intolerable to many in this class; so much so that, while but few come to be called reformers, many of them write, teach and defend reform sentiments of the most pronounced type. Carlyle, Ruskin, Morris, were professed reformers. Byron, Wordsworth and Whittier were so in fact if not in name. Many reformers will necessarily come from among the victims of a situation. Men who know of a culture that is denied them, who aspire to an equality which society promises in theory and denies in fact. When such classes—so numerous and important—are roused, reform sentiment thrives. They seek a better which they know and resent the limitations which they feel. The labor movement, Socialism, Anarchy, furnish illustration here. Many men of sympathetic nature and tender consciences, who see so much human misery in life and so much dishonesty in business; so much affirmation in theory and negation in practice, easily reach a condition of indignant protest which leads them into the reform army. An immense amount of reform sentiment is found among others who do not know what to do; clergymen, professional men, teachers, business men. Conviction is clear in them, but they see no way of reform that promises less evil than what they witness now.

One finds that many, in fact most reformers have a personal history which best explains their course. The more one thus studies the individual psychological aspects of reform, the more clearly one sees that men do not elect to be reformers by a bare act of reason. Temperament and circumstances explain much. The readiness of a Reformer to sacrifice everything and to suffer for the "cause" cannot be explained by argument. The practical bearing of this truth is that argument and statistics rarely make reformers and more rarely convert them from reform. Ruskin's classification of painters in "Stones of Venice" (vol. ii., p. 187) might well be applied to this thought. "Everything presented to them in nature has good and evil mingled in it; and artists considered as searchers after truth are again to be divided into three great classes: a right, a left and a center. Those on the right perceive and pursue the good and leave the evil; those on the center, the greatest, perceive and pursue the good and evil together; the whole thing as it verily is; those on the left perceive and pursue the evil and leave the good." The deeper tendency of Reform is to see the evil and miss the good, while that of conservatism is the inverse.

The spirit of Reform is strange, subtle, fascinating. It springs from a sense of wrong—outrage is a favorite word—and hence in its propaganda insists mainly on rights. It lacks, consequently, to some degree the sense of responsibility and the reserve which that

sense originally engenders. It is marked by extravagance of statement, little sense for detail or appreciation of slow complex social processes. It confuses the mental, moral, social and psychological elements in reform, and seems to miss the whole historical process of life. It is keenly sensitive to the ideal, hence marked by deep feeling and the power that feeling gives. It inclines often to abusive terms, and is essentially uncompromising. It deals with principles and large truths, comprehensive views, not with fragments and details, hence it cannot compromise. A Reformer said at the Buffalo convention in June, 1899: "The Reformer bows to nothing but genius and kneels to nothing but goodness;" and Wendell Phillips once said that reformers deal only with ideas, conscience and common sense. It is primarily unselfish even to the point of martyrdom; the reformer serving class or humanity and being distinctly conscious of a mission in the world. It is essentially aggressive, eager, possibly, as John Randolph said of it, "meddling, obtrusive, intrusive, restless, dissatisfied." It is so intent, concentrated on its work, that it has no inclination to study, admit or admire progress already made. It may not always deny—it is disinclined to see. It is supported by protest, justified by failure and hence its apology is in the limitations and not in the success of institutions.

We see in the spirit of reform a two-fold tendency to expand; it tends to become more intense in that it becomes more radical and it seeks to be all comprehensive. John Stuart Mill made it the object of his life to become a reformer of the world; one who has any acquaintance with reformers is familiar with the projects by which universal peace, joy and comfort are to be secured by a simple reform. A writer in the Fortnightly (Vol. lxx., p. 741) seeking to protect a reformer who had accomplished much good in New York from the imputation of being an extremist, said of him that he was one "who knew what could and could not be done; who was never content with less than the possible best, but who never threw away that possible best because it was not the ideal best; who did not try to reform the universe, but merely his own district." Then, too, reform tends to become more radical; its trend is not backward toward conservatism; it is forward. Hawthorne expressed this truth well in "Earth's Holocaust." The reformers first burned papers and periodicals; next decorations of nobility; then an impulse came to burn the nobles; next robes of royalty and crowns; then liquor and tobacco. The fever spread and people threw away possessions; weapons of war were next demolished; then instruments of torture and death; marriage certificates, money, books and literature. Then advance was made on ecclesiastical vestments and symbols—finally the bible.

The impulses of Reform are often noble, its aims high and ethical, yet it leans to abuse, hatred, impatience of personality; to means of questionable nature. It seems to think that reform is a matter merely of volition. To order or decree a reform, to make an appeal to the popular sense of justice, truth and harmony is sufficient. It constantly makes such appeal, fails as frequently and seems to learn nothing by experience. A band of reformers founded the Christian Political Union in Chicago in January, 1900. They were not numerous, but they were typical. The following announcement was made:

"We believe the fullness of time to have arrived when the eternal principles of justice, mercy and love, as exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, should be embodied in the political economy of our nation and applied in concrete form to every function of our government, national, State, municipal and local. We believe that the most direct means of accomplishing this end is the formation of a political body of united Christian men and women, who shall use their elective franchise for the selection of able, worthy and conscientious public officials who will seek in their respective positions to perform the functions of government in the spirit of the man of Galilee.

"We declare that this movement is in no sense ecclesiastical or dogmatic in its purpose, and contemplates no challenge of any person's faith or creed; aims not to disturb church relationships nor to unite Church and State in politico-ecclesiastical bonds, but seeks solely to unify the forces of righteousness in the name and spirit of Jesus for political, social and commercial reform."

The platform of the Populist Party in 1892 contained an equal amount of serene optimism, idealism and ignorance of the processes and limitations of life. "The forces of reform this day organized will never cease to move forward until every wrong is righted and equal rights and privileges established for all the men and women of the country." The party *decreed* "That the union of the labor forces of the United States this day consummated shall be permanent and perpetual."

Reform is, in its deeper nature, chained to the ideal. It goes on the assumption that people love and seek social truth and justice, development and culture. The assumption is false. Our popular philosopher has said that right is less loved in the world than is comfort; that "a healthy man will never reform while he has the strength." The masses are indifferent to reform, and they rarely support reform administrations. The Louisville Courier-Journal said (April 5, 1902) apropos of the New York Reform administration: "It was dangerous to promise unalloyed righteousness for

fear that the voters would not endorse the program." Thus is illustrated the wise remark of Mackenzie, who says in his "Social Philosophy" that whole truths are seldom so good to fight with as half truths. The conservative usually takes the half truth, the reformer, the whole one.

The Reform spirit draws reformers together, leads them to attempt party formation, though they generally fail to make a permanent party, unless practical measures—not specific to reform—be taken as a basis of union. A prohibition platform ranges over the whole field of political life. The Equal Rights party in 1884 contained thirteen planks that had no connection with Equal Rights. Consequently, reform is apt to have no long standing traditions, to lack in reverence for the past and in the caution, sense of reality and proportion which a past creates.

The task of Reform is never ending. When it has removed obstacles it must construct; when one task is done, another appears. When it has shown that a reform is necessary, as a rule it has not the position, leadership or wisdom to carry it through. An admitted reform becomes property of conservatism immediately. This latter adopts, fosters, enacts any measure which it cannot escape. Thus Reform is robbed of its victory. Twenty-five years ago a certain principle was secretly taught in labor circles. In 1902 it was incorporated ipsissimis verbis in the platform of one of our great parties as a self-evident proposition. It is now a conservative measure. Meantime Reform has moved on to other positions which, now radical, in the future will be conservative.

Not alone Reform's idealism, but as well the nature of social questions hinders reform from much success in its own name. It fails to analyze conditions; to locate causes; or locating them, it cannot control the remedy. As a rule, a given social evil or wrong is produced by causes far removed. Poverty may cause intemperance or vice versa; poor cooking at home or the personal faults of a wife may cause it; company may cause it, choice may cause it, as may despair, misfortune or shame. The temperance reformer is apt to ignore all of this and to propose one or two blanket remedies; prohibition and preaching chief among them. The degradation of a laborer's family may be due to personal fault, improvidence, poor management, natural calamity, villainy, or many other causes; shorter hours of work, higher wages or weekly payment of wages will scarcely remedy such a situation. Now reform, as a rule, is inclined to fail of such a careful analysis; it sees averages—which exist only in the mind—proposes average remedies and generally misses. In saying this, no reflection is made on the social value of measures such as those mentioned. The point is that Reform tends to miss causes, and hence it fails in applying remedies.

As said a moment ago, Reform sometimes succeeds in effecting the organization of a party. Thereby it falls below its ideals, for it attempts to work through institutions. It immediately shows signs of corruption, need of reform itself; so within the reform circle a radical and a conservative tendency will appear: "The reformers affirm the inward life, but they do not trust it, but use outward and vulgar means. They do not rely on precisely that strength which wins me to their cause; not on love, not on a principle, but on men, on multitudes, on circumstances, on money, on party; that is, on fear, on wealth, on pride." (Emerson). Reform's great error is in assuming that social wrongs are created by institutions and that they are cured by them. They are caused by *men*, and men alone can cure them. It is useless to take the crumbling brick that made an old house unsafe and try, by relaying it, to make a strong one. The evil is in the brick. "The fault is not in politics," said the Hon. Peter Sterling, "it is in humanity." The permanent limitations of the individual must mark the possibilities of reform; until those limitations are understood and computed as factors in every situation, reform is in vain. Mill discovered this, for he saw that the flaw in his life—he had hoped to reform the world—was a flaw in life itself.

With all these characteristics, Reform, nevertheless, is high, ethical and in purpose inspiring. It emphasizes the moral over the material; man over property. Its prominence in society insures progress and gives promise that ideals shall not perish, that hope shall not wane and that society shall long for perfection and peace, without which longing, no progress is possible.

The tendency of Reform to organize into party and its general failure to build a purely reform party suggest two further points of view, which may be of interest: namely, the psychological constitution of the individual reformer and of the reform party. The discussion of the reform spirit has been general; we may understand it better by coming closer to concrete reformers, even at the risk of some repetition.

A conviction is a wonderful thing. It transforms a being, becomes an absolute law, overthrows old standards and creates its own; it adjusts life to itself, seems even to call for a new psychology and to escape text book logic. To have seen—to think to have seen—one great vital human truth is the climax of life. It is such a vision that makes the apostle and the martyr. When this conviction has created a purpose and stimulated an ambition its conquest is complete. Now, there are small ideas and mighty ideas, small minds and great ones; real truths and ideal truths. When a powerful truth gets into a powerful mind that possesses "the sense of established facts," such a mind shows balance, power, concrete mas-

tery, sympathetic knowledge of social forces and institutions. We then have the strongest type of statesmen: Richelieu, Fox, Bismarck, Gladstone. When a powerful truth gets into a powerful mind which seems not to have the "sense of established facts," but rather to dwell in an ideal order of things, such a mind shows profound insight, keen sense of ideal relation, strong grasp of ethical ideals, uncorrected by the sense of the real limitations of life, or of the stern unyielding controlling processes of history. We then have the poet, prophet, ideal reformer, teacher: Ruskin, Carlyle, Tolstoi, Morris, Wordsworth, Maurice, Kingsley, possibly Henry George. When such men come into contact with an abuse which they set out to reform, they command great power and wage fierce war; as, for instance, is seen in Garrison and Phillips in the abolition movement. When a powerful truth gets into a small mind, or a narrow one, in which neither the ideal nor the real is understood, we have the enthusiast, agitator, fanatic, crank. Hawthorne says somewhere that powerful truth is like the rich grape juice expressed from the vineyard of the ages and that it has an intoxicating quality, except when imbibed by a powerful intellect. The will to dominate may be as great in one as in another, the subjective views, as clear, but the last named class, lacking power, understanding and self-control comes into view and attracts much attention; hence through it public opinion makes its estimate of all social reform and reformers.

The presumption is, generally, that any one interested in reform work is a crank. A witness before the Senate Committee on Labor and Capital in 1883, a man of national reputation, began his evidence by some remarks, made "to save his reputation and prevent himself from being considered a crank" (Vol. III., p. 342 Report). Another witness produced the following clipping from a newspaper: (ibid, 385). "The great majority of its witnesses are visionaries and cranks, each of whom has a panacea for curing all the ills of society. The basis of the panacea is always the same. It is that somebody should give something for nothing, and that the author of the scheme should be enabled to live in luxury without work. There has not been such an opportunity for universal babblement . . . for many moons, and all crankdom is stirred and encouraged." Then recently a circular advertising the Report of the Trust Conference in Chicago in 1899 took care to assure us that "The cranks and demagogues were absent. The speakers were eminently sane, and indulged in no threats nor forebodings, nor pessimism nor despair." The class is surely numerous, but such reformers are not understood. We should study them sympathetically because they are the final typical products of the psychological influences in all reform.

Taking up this class then, our reformer is a man of one idea; as has been said of the crank, "he sees one thing clearly but not in its relations." A well-known newspaper man quotes a prominent public leader as defining a moral crank to be one who believes what he says. This one thought, conviction, purpose or whatever we may call it, has so thoroughly mastered our reformer that it fixes the centre and circumference of his life. Self-sacrificing in all things that further his purpose, he is intolerant and uncompromising beyond it. Everything is judged by relation to the master thought. In the view of a reformer, for instance, drink causes all social evils, abstinence will cure them; in another, competition is the root of all evil, coöoperation eradicates it entirely; in another ignorance causes all vice, education will prevent it; in another separation of industry and religion is the fundamental wrong, the gospel alone applied to industry can bring relief. In every case, where the psychological process has worked unchecked, all of the complexities of social existence are simplified into one process; all social problems have one cause, and all possibilities of human development are seen in the one remedy. Maurice, who seems to have been a gentle but intense reformer, once said: "People sometimes find fault with me because I don't constantly say new things. I never had but one or two things I wanted to say, and I have all my life been trying to say them over and over again in different ways." (Contemporary Review, Vol. 65, article on Maurice.)

All of this implies that the reformer is an enthusiast, bouyant with faith in himself and his work, restless in propaganda and tireless in personal exertion. Hence he has no dread of opposition or of persecution. In fact, he courts it. Liebknecht's months in jail in Germany strengthened him greatly in his leadership of Socialism, it is said that Garibaldi held out as inducements to young Italians, poverty, hardships, battles and wounds, before victory. Higginson says in Contemporaries: "When a man once falls into the habit of measuring merit by martyrdoms, . . . the best abused man seems nearest to sainthood." Few great causes in human history have been established without causing pain to their most ardent supporters.

The concentration of the reformer, the gradual turning of sympathy, ambition and taste toward his cherished ideal, tends to destroy the sympathy, ambitions and tastes by which the average man is anchored in his place in society. Social position, friends, business affiliations, religious associates will in many cases be surrendered and supplanted by the fellowship of reform alone. Possibly nothing in our recent reform history is more pathetic than the isolation that came to Garrison and Phillips during abolition days. One of the

orators who spoke at the services over Altgeld in Chicago, after his death, Mr. Darrow, said:

"John P. Altgeld, like many of the earth's great souls, was a solitary man. Life to him was serious and earnest—an endless tragedy. The earth was a great hospital of sick, wounded and suffering, and he a devoted surgeon who had no right to waste one moment's time and whose duty was to cure them all. While he loved his friends, he yet could work without them, he could live without them, he could bid them one by one good-by when their courage failed to follow where he led, and he could go alone out into the silent night, and, looking upward at the changeless stars, could find communion there." Ruskin says in Fors, notes to Letter 76, that he had to maintain himself against the contradiction of everyone of his best friends. "Being entirely at one in my views of Nature and life with every great classic author, I am yet alone in the midst of a modern crowd which rejects them all."

An immediate penalty of this isolation is seen when reformers tend to become unconventional, even eccentric. Hence we hear of the "fringe of oddities" that ornaments reform. Hair, beard, habits of dress and of speech serve well to express to the world the presence of a reformer or of a party, as seen, for instance, in the abolition movement, the Quakers, or to some extent, in the Populist movement.

Another seeming result of this isolation is, the gradual loss of the sense of humor. The world is a hospital, life a tragedy, the reformer's duty, solemn. There is no time for laughter, no sympathy for mirth. The trait may be due in part to the general fact of concentration, for we notice that men in every walk of life, tend to become less jovial as they become intense. The entire absence of humor was remarkable in the physicist, Rowlands. No doubt, however, it is due to the specific temperament of the reformer and the nature of his thinking and feeling. A writer in the Contemporary (Vol. 78), in an admirable article on Ruskin seems to explain the phenomenon satisfactorily: "Cultivated minds dislike vehemence, and having been long familiar with heroes, crave in their intellectual food, the variety and stimulus afforded by cuisine; they are aware of the pain that lies about all grave questions and welcome any alleviation of their gravity. But when, as now, the prophet's constituency is widened to include thousands in whom this degree of cultivation is impossible; when new millions endowed every unit of them with the ancient passions, are pushing for their place, are demanding their satisfaction upon the narrowing circle of our habitable globe, and their pressure has unmeasurably increased the gravity of the problems to be dealt with—a leader of thought will jest at his peril.

Rather he should be incapable of jesting; he should be wholly possessed by an earnestness and intensity of feeling commensurate with the tremendous issues hanging in the balance. . . . The masses of struggling men and women to whom their names and something of their work were known, loved and reverenced them chiefly because they believed in their sincerity and compassion, believed them incapable of sitting like Epicurean gods in the circle of their golden chairs and looking down upon

> . . . The fierce confederate storm of sorrow barricaded evermore
> Within the walls of cities,

as a joke.

Nevertheless we do find some exceptions among reformers. Maurice relished humor, Wesley was always bright and cheerful, and those who knew the genial Ignatius Donnelly never tired of listening to his witty speech. The absence of the sense of humor, however, generally remarked in advanced reformers, handicaps them because it puts them out of sympathy with life and invites ridicule from the public. Man is always ens risible.

When the normal tendencies of reform have developed fully, a reform habit of mind is engendered. Reformers acquire the mental habit of protest. Vocabulary, sympathy, feeling belong to the reform order, the search for sorrow and the blight of sin are familiar, the degradation of man and the disappointments of life have been thought about, talked about, dreamt about until the reformer finds neither rest, nor peace, nor joy, except in their atmosphere. Hence when A sees his first ambition satisfied, his reform established in whole or in part, he does not return to ordinary pursuits and to the normal view of life as perhaps, Cincinnatus did. He looks for something else to reform. Garrison became an abolitionist, then anti-constitution, anti-government, anti-church.

Phillips was an abolitionist, then in succession an advocate of woman's rights, a temperance worker, a pleader for Ireland's cause, a labor leader, finally a currency reformer. In fact, he identified himself with every reform of his age. Another reformer now before the public was first a temperance reformer, later he devoted his energies to the Sabbath reform, then to labor, anti-lottery, woman's suffrage, civil service and ballot reform. This development is generally in the direction of radicalism. We find many who passed successively through the labor movement from conservative to radical, then into single tax work, socialism, finally, into anarchy. Whatever be the relations of these reforms logically or objectively, that they are psychologically closely identified is beyond question.

The Reformer is apt to think that the world is against him. Con-

vinced of his own ability and wisdom, he unconsciously identifies himself with his cause; his reformed world is one which primarily gives his talent free play and exalts him to a commanding position. After the Kaweah Colony of Reformers in California failed, one of its officers wrote of it: (Out West, September, 1902.) "Every man who came here, with but few exceptions, came under the belief that his particular talents and abilities had not been properly recognized in the outside world; that a capitalistic cabal or conspiracy there existed against him and that here in Kaweah his merits would be instantly noted and that he would at once assume his natural position as a leader of affairs." Of course, such a revelation of this trait could be looked for only in circumstances such as a reform colony presents. In a colony reform attempts to actualize itself and shape life.

There are many more traits which one might mention, were it not too tedious and apt to distract the reader from the main point. For instance: the loss of mental and moral perspective in the mind of the reformer; the forgetfulness of self seen in the beginning and the omnipresence of self seen in the end; the high ethical character of the ends of reformers and the questionable means so often employed; the strange association of pessimism and optimism which so many writers note.

Reformers are much inclined to fellowship among themselves. The common fate of isolation which society inflicts on them, likeness of temperament and sympathetic attitude on many problems, would naturally favor the habit of association among them. Differences of culture, faith, disposition or wealth seem not to hinder the strangest sort of fellowship. This was seen in the composition of the Kaweah Colony referred to above. The writer quoted says it was "the United States in miniature; among the members are old and young, rich and poor, wise and foolish, educated and ignorant, worker and professional." "There were temperance men and their opposites, churchmen and agnostics, free thinkers, Darwinists and spiritualists; bad poets and good, musicians, artists, prophets and priests. There were dress reform cranks and phonetic spelling fanatics, word purists and vegetarians. It was a mad, mad world and being so small, its madness was the more visible." A common ideal, one great hope, one controlling impulse drew them together and blinded them to the permanent and deep reaching differences which would hinder unity forever. The same seems to have been the fate of nearly all if not all of the colony efforts of our socialist reformers. The same has been the case with reform parties and even reform conventions from time immemorial. Temperance workers, the abolition movement, Populists, Socialists, Anarchists,

offer no exception. Hawthorne, who lived in a time of great reform activity, when reform numbered distinguished men and women among its champions, sadly remarks in the Procession of Life: "It is harder to contrive a friendly arrangement of these brethren of love and righteousness in the procession of life than to unite even the wicked who indeed are chained together by their crimes. The fact is too preposterous for tears, too lugubrious for laughter."

A party in social or political life is generally a compromise; the platform represents no one fully, but it does represent many, partially. No two thinking men think alike, nor could they ever agree if they attempted to express their views on everything. No dozen men agree entirely on anything. Leaders in a party pay due attention to this. They study with care the trend of thought and feeling and construct platforms with a professed view to victory over opponents rather than to the expression of truth as such. Hence a platform must please all; it need represent no one accurately. Much will be sacrificed in principle declaration or purpose, in order to avoid schism or to win doubtful adherents. Then when compromise is made and the platform is adopted, little attention is paid to it except in as far as opponents challenge it or orators use it for purposes of campaign.

The conservative is past master in the art of party organization. Lincoln was credited with the possession of the last great secret of politics; that of going twain willingly with those who had compelled him to go an unwilling mile. The reformer's deeper impulse is to say everything that he thinks and to have thoughts on everything that presents itself to his mind. He is always positive, always a propagandist; he always insists that those with whom he deals think as he thinks. Consequently he does not understand the art of compromise and he fails as a builder of parties. He may make verbal compromises in the attempt to organize a party, but in so doing he does not alter views or minimize his demands. On the contrary, he forces his views on every one, without discrimination. In view of this truth the history of reform parties is not surprising. All kinds of reformers will flock together and join any new party which seems to promise victory. The result is a combination of warring elements that insures prompt disaster. The National Social and Political Conference held in Buffalo June, 1899, framed a platform which at the time was described as a "second-hand lumber yard." Another convention of the same sort held in Louisville in April, 1902, was composed of delegates from the following parties: The Public Ownership Party of Missouri, Independent Labor Party, and of Socialists, Fusionists, Silver Democrats, Silver Republicans "and others." There were three hundred delegates from twenty States

who aimed "To build a platform large enough for all reform parties, large enough for all the reform men, women and children of the United States to stand upon." Conservatives would have aimed to make the platform vague enough to offend no one, and small to cause no embarrassment. The convention spent most of its time and energy in wrangling over a name. It has not been heard of since.

The history of the Populist Party illustrates the whole exposition of reform which has been attempted in these pages. There was in it much that was honest, noble, timely, and even hopeful. It seemed to promise to meet a national need which had been ignored by our great parties, but it quickly went the way of its predecessor, the Greenback Party, and it is now scarcely more than memory. It swallowed up nearly every small reform movement in the country, counting within its ranks Anarchists, Socialists of all schools, Labor Unionists, Grangers and Farmers' Alliance men, Greenbackers, Prohibitionists and Single Taxers. Its rise to power was phenomenal; it leaped into existence; placed representatives in both houses of Congress and secured the balance of power there, controlled many states and at least one university. In 1892 it polled over a million votes and seemed to promise much in the way of reform. But its disintegration was as rapid as its rise. The platform proclaimed the utter desolation of the land, the total bankruptcy of our institutions and the entire depravity of the party in power. It declared that every wrong should be righted and the equal rights should be established for all. The convention of 1892 isolated the party from the healthy sentiment of the nation so completely that it was doomed. While politicians had been frightened, the public had been amused, and the humorous columns of our newspapers had been furnished with abundant material for ridicule and wit. The great convention was described by a metropolitan daily as a "collection of wild-eyed cranks, an enormous aggregation of life failures, the collarless contingent, men of low degree with ill-fitting clothes." The party showed great depth of feeling, much honesty of purpose and intense idealism. Schism appeared, then mutual suspicion, then abuse. Corruption followed, then fusion with any party, in order to share the spoils. Its ambition was soon brought down from the service of an ideal to the service of self, and then life flickered out quickly. Its greatest service was rendered in its failure. It taught us that noble ideas cannot overcome the laws of social life and the limitations of our nature, that reform must study the latter more, and the first much less, if it would contribute effectively to the uplifting of man.

The case is the same with the Socialists. We have in the United

States many types: the philanthropic, the Fabian, the Philosophic, the Christian socialist, the economic socialist, the colonizer. Agreeing in the essential element of socialism, they constantly disagree in detail, abuse one another and show far more bad temper, suspicion and abuse than the prosaic conservatives who admittedly stand on a far lower plane of ethical profession. The socialists are all equally idealistic, all see with equal clearness the social iniquity against which they protest, but all miss the reality, the modifications of principle imposed upon men by nature, and the slow devious ways in which social forces work.

Naturally some reform parties do acquire stability and become factors in a nation, but very probably one would find upon examination that external circumstances and practical measures which are not specific to reform give such a party most of the strength which it may show.

This study of the subjective side of Reform may aid one to understand the serious nature of the whole problem and to estimate more accurately the varieties of representatives which the cause possesses. An objective study of the facts in the social situation, an analysis of elements in it and a view of the permanent limitations to which all reform will ever be exposed, would be required to complete the subject. Such a study can lead to but one result—one sometimes noticed and rarely appreciated in its full significance, namely that there can be and will be no social reform without individual reform; there will be no individual reform that is not moral and religious; there will be no religious reform of the individual until he recognizes that soul is higher than mind or body; that conscience is more sacred than power or wealth, self-respect more precious than learning, service of fellow man nobler than self-seeking and service of God noblest of all.

The social question is a religious question; social reform is religious reform. Possibly a development of these thoughts will be attempted in a subsequent article.

William J. Kerby.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

HISTORY OF SCHOOLS—A SUPPRESSED CHAPTER.

IT is not always prudent to ask a hearing for an old story. But there are also occasions when we are pushed to a repetition of tales which we had most prudently taken to be only too well known. Not so very long ago, in the work of teaching Catechism to stray boys who had not made their First Communion, we were visited by a lad who was what we are now beginning to call a graduate of a grammar school. His name might have belonged to an Irish king; and he had received the faith in baptism. We tried to learn the Baltimore Catechism by heart; but it would not go. The words were new and the pronunciation was hard. So we had to go at it again by simply reading aloud, and the explanations proceeded slowly as sentence after sentence could be read coherently. In the course of time we reached the end of the "Third Lesson." We were reading in *Number One.* "Lesson Fourth" has this heading: "On the Angels and our First Parents." And there occurred a dialogue:

Preceptor. The next time, we shall have something about what is called original sin, a sin that Adam committed. *(And playfully)* Did you ever hear of Adam?

Disciple. No, sir.

Preceptor (a little anxious at this revelation). Did you ever hear that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God?

Disciple. No, sir.

Preceptor. Did you ever hear that Christ died for us upon a cross?

Disciple. No, sir.

Now, this was a case in which an old story had to be told over again. The boy's mind was historically vacant down to beyond the beginning of days. So we took out a huge quarto Douay Bible, and began where "the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," and we worked our way along to the eating of the forbidden fruit.

Since these events transpired we do not know how many millions of dollars have been poured into the elementary schools. In the three years there have been educational bequests to the sum of two hundred and sixty-three millions, and the multiplied library foundations are beaming as so many auroras at the book companies. But with all these advantages we doubt whether the grammar school graduate has yet been put upon a traject from the hypothetic nebluæ to the garden of Eden. As we advance along educational grades we find kindred wonders of scholarship—and notably in matters of fact. We see that minds are being continuously trained to skirt

the rim of some great vacuum in so-called historical studies. The vacuum process is pursued with great energy even in the training of teachers. Indeed, this seems to be regarded as the most secure way of bringing about the result in the minds of the scholars. Nature, indeed, abhors a vacuum; but there is no telling what art can do.

In the pages of this *Review* (January, 1902), attention was called to the writings of M. Compayré, and to the mutilation of text to which he descends in order to sustain untruthful statement. A translation of M. Compayré's *History of Pedagogy* is in high honor in many Institutes where teachers are being formed for our schools. The author, himself, has been a very much patronized protégé of a government which has sought to achieve glory with pick-axe and battering-ram, by driving from their homes thousands of defenseless women whose pure lives had been consecrated to prayer and charity and to the silent uplifting of the heaviest part of the public burden. This association, alone, might mark the author's feeling towards the monastic name. But he took the pen and distilled his spirit into the printed page, as we can see from the analysis both of what he has written and of what he has left out. In the previous article we noted his malicious sneer at the monastery of St. Gall. Without any other mention of the establishment, he puts its entire glorious history of seven centuries into a single sentence: "In 1291 of all the monks in the convent of St. Gall, there was only one who could read and write." The American translator, as we remarked, says that there was not even one monk who could read or write. Now, the fact is that the traditional reference in this matter does not speak of the monks at all. It speaks of the *Chapter*. In 1291, the *Chapter* had been taken possession of by civil princes, and this *Chapter* had been stocked with fighting men. These men were thrust into orders that they might be given the position, and they did not even live in the monastery. But we have discussed this question elsewhere.

Upon the same page (p. 55, Edition 1901), speaking of the centuries between St. Jerome and Charlemagne, M. Compayré writes: "If the first doctors of the Church occasionally showed some sympathy for profane letters, it was because, in their youth, before having received baptism, they themselves had attended the pagan schools. But when these schools were closed Christianity opened no others, and after the fourth century a profound night covered humanity." Here we beg leave to tell once more the old story of how the bridge was built over the awful chasm between civilization and civilization.

I.

During just one thousand years Rome had been expanding from

the condition of a shepherd's hut where Romulus and Remus were reared upon the slope of the Aventine beside the Tiber. After the thousand years, Rome embraced the world. She had absorbed the learning of Greece, the conquests of Alexander, the trade of Tyre and Carthage, the granaries of the three Continents around her inland sea. Her name and her language were upon distant cities which she had either conquered or founded: Lyons, Arles, Cordova, Carthage, Cologne, Jerusalem, London. Amid all the splendor of empire the old Roman stock decayed, was dying—dying from causes that will bring extinction to any race, causes that are decimating polished societies to-day. The Emperor Commodus had ascended the throne and had given an illustration of cruelty and debauchery truly imperial in the records of individual crime. In one hundred years, from Commodus to Diocletian (284), eighty Emperors rose and fell and only two or three of them died a natural death. The Roman stock was rotten, and these Emperors were barbarian generals who had been trained to Roman arms—Africans, Moors, Scythians, Arabs, Thracians, Pannonians and Goths.

But with her world-wide sway, with her magnificent roadways and water-ways that led from the Forum into three Continents, and with all her efforts to recruit her disappearing high society from the lower, Rome stood helpless when the deluge came. The barbarians had felt her weakness and were closing in upon her. Even as early as the year 260, the legend goes, the Emperor Valerian, captured by King Sapor, was executed and flayed; and his skin, painted red, was hung up in a Parthian shrine as a warning to the queen city that sat upon the seven hills. In a century's time the tribes that had formed the armies of the Empire began to aspire to empire and to move up to the borders. With the Parthians and Saracens on the east, there were the Quadi and the Sarmatians above the Black Sea, and the Huns beyond. Along the Rhine and across the Danube there had gathered the Francs, the Suevi, the Germans, the Lombards, the Saxons, the Heruli, the Vandals, the Gepidæ, the Burgundians, the Goths and the Alans. The day of Daniel's prophecy was at hand. Civil wars arose throughout the Empire. Then there were plagues and famine and earthquakes. And the flood came. It was not a deluge of water. It was a deluge of fire and blood, of tribe after tribe, and race after race. There was darkness over the earth. It was the most terrible scourge that humanity had ever beheld.

There were let loose upon the Empire the nations which God had reserved for the day of His vengeance. The work of ten centuries seemed to go to ruin in a day. The barriers were broken and the flood-gates were opened on every side; and there poured in not merely upon the outlying border provinces of the Empire, but over

all its most typical seats of learning and luxury and magnificence, a long pent up torrent of carnage and desolation. So it went on until, in 410, Alaric with his Goths swept like a burning tempest over the peninsula of Italy, sacking and devastating the imperial city. The infants of that awful time had come to be but of middle age when Attila, calling himself the scourge of God, mustered his restless Huns, three-quarters of a million of them, at the base of the Ural Mountains, and cut a swath across the continent of Europe, until from the Gallic seacoast he looked out upon the billows of the Atlantic. As he stood before the impregnable fortress of Orleans, Aetius, the last of the Romans, called in the Francs and the Visigoths, fell upon the Hun, and drove him back, step by step, over the width of France into the great plains of Chalons in Champaigne. And here the two armies about equal in numbers, Frank and Gaul and Visigoth on one side, and Hun upon the other, the greatest armies that have ever faced one another on a single battle field, fought hand to hand. One-third of the Hunnish army was left there to fertilize the champaign of Chalons; the remaining half million was hurled back across the Rhine.

Attila was stunned, but in the next year he was on the march, mowing his way down through Germany and Switzerland and northern Italy. As he neared Mantua there came out to him the Vicar of Christ, a Leo, the man of God to the scourge of God. And Leo told him in the name of God not to lay his finger upon Rome which had become the city of God's anointed. Right there, the swarthy Hun turned back. His work was done. He led his army over the Alps and died leaving to the world no trace of his tomb or of a kingdom.

In the meantime the north of Africa, the garden of the Roman Empire and the garden of her vices, had been swept by the Vandals. As if the visitations of Alaric and Attila had not been enough, Genseric must lead his Vandals across to the northern shore. And they went over like a cloud of locusts to see if, perchance, there might still be some sinews glued to the dismembered corpse of empire. It was only two years after the departure of Attila that Genseric entered the city of Rome. St. Leo persuaded him to spare the city from fire and blood and to be satisfied with a tribute. But the work of the Vandals was accomplished. They had gone over into Africa from the north, to transplant their ruggedness into that bower of Roman vice, and in half a century from the day when Genseric stood before St. Leo in Rome, the Vandals were no longer a nation. To-day, after fourteen hundred years, we employ the term, vandalism, as our strongest expression for the spirit of ravage and destruction and wanton ruin. And so the story goes on. Any recollection that

had been left of the scarlet woman even in distant Britain was lost in the bloody raids of Picts and Scots, of Angles and Saxons.

So, tribe followed tribe and race followed race, coursing hither and thither over the prostrate form of imperial magnificence. They did not care to rest in fair fields and by flowing streams which might have been theirs simply for the staying. It seemed they could not rest so long as there was a barrier beyond to be levelled or a province to be overrun. And when the work to which Providence had sent them was done, they stopped just where they found themselves; people separated from people by the natural boundaries of what were to be the states of modern Europe. The Visigoths were in Spain; the Francs were in upper Gaul; the Burgundians were between; the Ostrogoths were in Lombardy; the Allemani, Bavarians, Saxons and various other tribes were scattered over the territory lying between the Alps and the northern sea.

II.

Now, in the very olden time, in the days of a civilization that went before the civilization of the Roman Empire, there was known to exist an island to the west of Britain and to the north of Gaul. This island was spoken of by the Phoenicians and the Mediterranean mariners of old as the "western island." Plutarch speaks of it as entering into what was ancient history in his time. We have not to consider its very ancient history; but the Annals of the Four Masters certainly stand solitary and majestic amid all purely human records. The people of the island had their own alphabet 1500 years ago and were writing history in it then. Their preservation of genealogies after the style of the book of Genesis indicates their antiquity and the truth of the record that they came from the orient. Sir W. K. Sullivan says: "Circumstances were favorable in Ireland to the growth and preservation of ethnic legends. Amongst these favorable circumstances were the long continuance of tribal government and the existence of a special class whose duty it was to preserve the genealogies of the ruling families and keep in memory the deeds of their ancestors. . . . With all their drawbacks, the Irish ethnic legends, when stripped of their elaborate details and Biblical and classical loans express the broad facts of the peopling of Ireland and are in accordance with archæological investigation." (Encyc. Brit. art. Ireland, pp. 243, 244.)

In the third century this island was known as Scotia, and its people as the Scoti, or Scots. They had planted colonies in the north of the island of Britain; and the north of Britain is, to this day, called Scotland. In 439, Pope St. Celestine sent out Palladius as

Bishop over the Scots believing in Christ. Little is known of the mission of Palladius. Shortly after, there came to Scotia a certain Patricius, a scion of one of patrician houses of Rome. He is known to us as Patrick. He had twice been a captive on the island; and, upon his release he betook himself to study, that he might return to labor for the conversion of his captors. He is said to have gone to Tours, and to have been the nephew of St. Martin, the Bishop of Tours. He is also spoken of as having studied under St. Germanus at Auxerre; then, at some islands in the Mediterranean, evidently the islands of Lerins; and, finally, at Rome. He was consecrated Bishop and started back to Scotia or Ireland. The inhabitants followed the doctrines of druidism. Their chief object of worship seems to have been the sun. But there is absolutely no record of the bloodiness of Gaulish druidism among them; and neither is there any indication that they were tainted with the cruelty and immorality that we find in Grecian and Roman paganism.

One of the chief works of Patrick was the establishment of schools. Some affirm that he established schools in as many as one hundred localities. It is certain that he founded what was afterwards the noted school of Armagh. A few items about the Irish schools may serve to open the eyes of many who are preparing themselves to be teachers by studying the history of education. The story of the Irish schools is an essential key to the history of modern civilization. We can here merely hint at a few facts. "Within a century after the death of St. Patrick," says Bishop Nicholson, "the Irish seminaries had so increased that most parts of Europe sent their children to be educated there, and drew thence their bishops and teachers." Elsewhere, as history shows us, Christianity, on its introduction, encountered the axe of the persecutor. Here it only roused enthusiasm for the study of letters and the practice of the religious life. An immense territory around Leighlin was called the "land of saints and scholars," and soon the whole island was known abroad as the "island of saints and of doctors." The schools of the isle of Aran, Aran of the flowers, which became Aran of the saints, were founded in 480, four years after the absolute breakdown of the Roman power in the west. The school of Aran was a noted resort for students from the Continent, for it was the home of great masters. Here Kieran and Brendan taught; and also Fursey, before he went out to found his schools in England and in France. Hither, too, did Columba (Columkil), poet, artist, founder, intrepid missioner, betake himself to breathe its soft atmosphere of holiness and science, before he went out to his work amid the northern storms. About the year 530, Finian began the schools of Clonard in Westmeath, and lived to see the scholars there number three thousand. Kieran and Bren-

dan and Columba studied under this Finian at Clonard. In 548, Kieran went out to found the celebrated school of Clon-mac-nois, the retreat of the sons of the noble, on the banks of the Shannon. Fintan founded the school of the Ivy Cave at the foot of Mount Bladin in Queen's county. From the Ivy Cave went Saint Comgall, who established the renowned school of Benchor near the bay of Carrickfergus, in 559. Benchor numbered three thousand. St. Bernard speaks of it as having sent out a swarm of saints into foreign lands, and its most illustrious scholar was Columbanus, the apostle of Burgundy and Italy. From it also came Luanus, who founded the school of Clonfert in Leinster. There was another Clonfert, founded by Brendan in Connaught. Brendan is a poetic name. Some may regard as a legend his seven years' voyage and his discovery of a land across the western ocean. But it was the most popular legend of the middle ages. Christopher Columbus was strengthened in his belief of a land to the west by this very legend, as also by the book of the Irishman, Feargil, or Virgil, on the rotundity of the earth, written seven centuries before the first voyage of Columbus. To illustrate the numbers that attended the school of Brendan, at Clonfert in Connaught, the story was told that the master, one day, whilst out for a stroll, lost his book, and discovered the loss only on his return. The scholars set out immediately in search of it. The master had been to the top of a neighboring hill. The fleetest runner arrived there first, picked up the book, and then simply passed it down the line until it was put into the hands of Brendan.

All this we find in the sixth century, only one hundred years from the death of St. Patrick. But take the complete record of the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. Schools sprang up, as it were like towns, Bangor and Clonard and Birr had each three or four thousand students. In the ninth century there were seven thousand students at Armagh; and it had its rivals at Lismore and Cashel and Dindaleathglass. So extensive did the University of Armagh become that it was eventually divided into three sections; and one section was devoted to the Anglo-Saxon students. In the eighth century it was endowed by the Kings of Ireland, and it survived the devastations of the Danes in the ninth and tenth centuries, rising up from its ashes. And we read in the statues of Clonard, in the eleventh century, that no one shall be allowed to teach in the other universities who has not studied at Armagh. We have here cold, unassailable facts. The settling peoples gazed and wondered. The students came flocking from every clime. The learning which they could not find at home, in the bustle of migration and war, they knew they would find in the island

of saints and doctors. Schools were everywhere; whole cities were turned into schools where religion lent a sacred character to study. There was the German, the Cimbrian, the Frank, the Pict, the Italian. They came in thousands and tens of thousands to hear from the lips of the Irish scholars the lore of the olden time and to study in the lives of saintly men the true interpretation of Christian morality and Christian perfection.

Bede, a Saxon historian of the seventh century, speaking of the numbers that went over from England to Ireland, says: "They were all most freely admitted, and supplied gratis with daily sustenance, books and masters." MacPherson says that "in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries religion and learning flourished to such a degree in Ireland that it was commonly styled the mother country of saints, and reputed the kingdom of arts and sciences." Camden, writing in the sixteenth century, says: "Our Anglo-Saxons went, in those times, to Ireland, as to a fair, to purchase knowledge, and we find in our authors that, when a person was absent, it was generally said of him, by way of proverb, that he was sent to Ireland to receive his education."

III.

But it did not all remain at home; nor did the Irish Doctors wait for others to come to them. As early as 563, Columba, after founding two schools, went in a wicker boat with twelve companions, over to Scotland. Conall, King of the Albanian Scots, bestowed upon him the island of I or Hi, which we know as Iona, in the western Hebrides. Here he laid the foundation of what was to be the most celebrated school in western Europe. As many as three hundred schools were, in the course of time, established from it. Then, there is the other Columba (Columbanus) called the father of the Irish missionaries. He journeyed through France, Germany and Switzerland and died in Italy where his name rests to-day upon an Italian town. His companion, St. Gall, whom he left behind, an invalid, amongst the Germans of Switzerland, set himself to evangelize and civilize the tribes of the Allemani. His hut, by the Steinach, became the nucleus of a town; then of a state, called after him; and his name is still upon the city of St. Gall. How many readers of to-day will recognize as Irish the names of the scholars who went out to labor among the pagan tribes? Here are a few of them. St. Frigidian was twenty-eight years bishop of Lucca, in Italy; and the church of that city is still called after him. St. Livinus was a bishop and martyr in Flanders. St. Arbogast was bishop of Strasburg in Germany. St. Cathal was bishop of Tarentum in Italy; he has left his name to the town of San Cataldo. His

brother, St. Donatus, was bishop of Lecce in the kingdom of Naples, and also bishop of Fiesole in Tuscany. St. Sedulius was bishop of Oreto in Spain, whither he had been sent on an ecclesiastical mission by Pope Gregory the Second. There is St. Albuin, bishop of Buraburg, near Fritzlar in Saxony. Then we have St. Rumold of Mechlin, or Malines, in Belgium. He was the son of the king of Leinster. He resigned his right of succession to become a religious and a student. He was made bishop of Dublin. He went to Rome and handed his episcopal ring to Pope Stephen the Second, and begged to be allowed to go out to the conversion of the tribes. He journeyed up to where the Scheldt pours into the northern sea, and planted his cross amid the thickets and the marsh. Upon that spot now stands the city of Malines, and the Cathedral of Malines, one of the most exquisite and most venerable monuments of the world's architecture, is dedicated under his patronage. Upon the Rhine, between Basel and Schaffhausen, we pass the town of Saeckingen. The very air here is fragrant with the praises of the Irishman Fridolin. Fridolin—we meet his name at Metz, at Strasburg, along the Moselle, at Eller on the Rhine, and even in Burgundy. Schiller has sung his praises,

Ein frommer Knecht war Fridolin;

and in the masterpiece, "Der Trompeter von Saeckingen," the great bard, Scheffel, pours out the well-springs of his art over Fridolin whom he makes the patron of his hero. Again, in the choir of the church of Rheinau in Switzerland we see the tomb of St. Fintan who founded a school there more than a thousand years ago. The very name of Bridget is testimony to the widespread influence of the Irish scholars abroad. The memory of this daughter of Hibernia is kept in special veneration at Seville, Lisbon, Placentia, Tours, Besancon, Namur in Belgium, Quimper, Gien, Venice, Mayence, Treves, Wurzburg, Constance, Strasburg, Cologne and many other places. The whole country around Ghent is under the patronage of St. Livinus. And on the 8th of July, 1889, forty thousand strangers gathered into the city of Wurtzburg to celebrate the anniversary of Killian, who founded his school there twelve hundred years ago.

Now, what of all this? It is an exhibition of the providence of God over humanity. The barbarians had swept over every inch of ground that was tainted with the Roman vice that followed Roman rule. But the Roman eagles were never planted on the Hibernian coast. Tacitus tells us that the conquest of the island was once proposed by the General Agricola; but the project was never entered into by the Senate. So, also, when the barbarians, in the mission which they did not understand, were obliterating every trace of

Roman rule, even in the island of Britain, they did not think of crossing the channnel to the western island. And thus it was that when Rome was laid waste and the grass grew upon the marble balustrades of imperial villas, when the fierce barbarians watered their horses in the Tiber and stabled them in the patrician palaces and gorgeous temples of the desolated empire, the tidal wave never reached the green shores of the land of future promise. So, whilst great centres of pagan culture in Europe, Asia and Africa were sharing the fate of the Empire, and libraries were being used for fuel on the ground that the Koran was book enough, Ireland was, beginning with the fifth century and through the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, and up to the very day of the coming of the Dane, the peaceful home of religion and the nursery of science and of art. Providence had made timely choice of this far-off land wherein the lamp of a divinely lighted science might burn with tranquil flame, and preparation be made for a new order of civilization that was to be created amongst new peoples.

The men to whom this work was committed were monks, and they were school men. But their schooling was very broad. Manual occupation entered into their daily life. Take this same St. Gall's during the centuries of which we are speaking. It had a department for every trade and art—agriculture, smelting, weaving, carving, and even boat-building. Nearly all in the Irish schools were skilled at the forge. These men, besides being educators in letters, were civilizers in every sense. They taught the people they went to, all the arts of peace. They went from study and writing to manual work as their exercise and recreation. The hand that forged the plow often wrote those delicate pages which form the greatest treasures of our modern libraries. The book of Kells, written 1500 years ago, most probably by the Columba of Iona, shows, even under the microscope, a freshness and brilliancy in its colored illustrations and illuminations, which give it the appearance of a production of yesterday. These men were logicians and mathematicians; and nowhere do we find rhyme earlier than in their poems; so that we often see rhyme alluded to as the "art of the Irish."

These, then, were the men who went out amongst the tribes that were moving. When one colony was destroyed, another hurried to the breach. Thus, during those centuries, they labored. In the meantime, they joined hands with the sons of St. Benedict who came up from the mountain rock of Casino, and together they Christianized and civilized the tribes as these settled; and thus they made it possible for Charlemagne to find a body of Christian peoples who would accept him for their high lord suzerain. In just four centuries from the descent of Alaric, on Christmas day in the year 800,

Charlemagne was crowned Emperor over all the peoples occupying the territory of modern Europe that lies between the North Sea and Naples and between the Ballkans and Gibraltar. And the crown was put upon him by the Pope, at Rome, in the Church of St. Peter. Through this territory civil governments had been established by the Saxons, Bavarians, Suevi, Burgundians, Francs, Lombards, Visigoths, Allemani, etc., within the boundaries which are occupied by their descendants to-day. How had the original confusion been reduced even so far into order? This is the chapter that is simply suppressed in the books that are put into the hands of the students of education to-day. Barbarous tribes had been transformed into *citizens*. This is precisely what had been done with them. And "citizenship" is the shibboleth of the present hour. The barbarians had been made *cives*. Roving tribes that lived in war camps had been made the inhabitants of cities. They had their own civil governments within fixed territories. They had their codes of laws and their courts, and they had what we are striving for, a central court of arbitration. In our one hundred and twenty-five years of existence, when our civilization has come in contact with the tribes, it has corrupted them or exterminated them. That old education which took account of the whole man, of immortal soul as well as body, of eternity as well as time, fashioned whole peoples into citizenship out of the very rawest material. Our new education, which ignores the better half of human nature and of human duration, cannot keep men in the spirit of a citizenship with which it finds them endowed.

IV.

But we had only to tell a story; and it has been told. It has a sequel; but that does not concern us here except merely to state that when the providential office of the schools had been exercised, the schools, themselves, of the western island began to disappear. In the year 790, or just ten years before Charlemagne was crowned as Emperor in the new civilization, the Danes landed in Ireland. Schools and churches were levelled. They rose again. They were burned again and again. The students and doctors were slaughtered or dispersed. For two hundred and twenty-five years, with breathing intervals, did the war go on. At length there arose a great Christian warrior who in his seventy-sixth year drove the last of the Danish invaders into the sea. But then came the mail-clad Anglo-Norman who built castles instead of schools. How he fixed his hold upon the land is history. Then the Anglo-Norman abjured his faith, and the island of saints and doctors became the island of martyrs. Here we come upon the book of Ireland's trial. We need

not open it. It is dripping with blood. Its cover is as the funeral shroud, the winding sheet of an ancient race. Its table of contents are penal laws that might have been dictated by the archfiend. Its lines are written in the life-stream of broken hearts and in gall of the bitterest sorrow. Its illustrations are ghastly scenes of flame and crime, of smoking thatch and slaughtered babe, and bones that bleach by the wayside as linen on the heather.

WILLIAM POLAND, S. J.

St. Louis University.

WHO WAS S. MARY MAGDALEN?

THERE is perhaps hardly any saint of God to whom men feel more drawn than to the heroic woman whose name stands in the title of this paper. "I came not to call the just but sinners" was the Divine announcement, and He proved it by the forgiveness of the Magdalen. He was "the Friend of publicans and sinners," not merely in the Pharisee's taunt, but in very deed, and wished to be known in history as such.

> Amen I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memorial of her.[1]

Hence it is that all the Evangelists have dwelt with lingering pathos on that scene which portrayed so perfectly the character of the Saviour of the world—the woman kneeling at His feet and anointing Him as He said "beforehand . . . for the burial."

But though the scene thus described is so well known to us all, and though her name has passed into a bye-word, it is remarkable that the Gospel narrative is not very explicit as to the identity of S. Mary Magdalen. We find first of all "the woman that was a sinner in the city" then Mary Magdalen, then Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, and then again simply "Mary." Are all these one and the same person, or are they four different women?

A brief examination of the Gospel passages concerned may simplify the question.

> And one of the Pharisees desired him to eat with him. And he went into the house of the Pharisee, and sat down to meat.
> And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster-box of ointment;
> And standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.
> And the Pharisee, who had invited him, seeing it, spoke within himself, saying:

[1] S. Mark xiv., 9.

This man, if he were a prophet, would know surely who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

And Jesus answering, said to him: Simon, I have somewhat to say to thee. But he said: Master, say *it.*

A certain creditor had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty.

And whereas they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which therefore of the two loveth him most?

Simon answering said: I suppose that he to whom he forgave most. And he said to him: Thou hast judged rightly.

And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she with tears hath washed my feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them.

Thou gavest me no kiss; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but she with ointment hath anointed my feet.

Wherefore I say to thee: Many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much. But to whom less is forgiven, he loveth less.

And he said to her: Thy sins are forgiven thee.

And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

And he said to the woman: Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace.[2]

Now there was a certain man sick named Lazarus, of Bethania, of the town of Mary and of Martha her sister.

(And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair: whose brother Lazarus was sick.)

His sisters therefore sent to him, saying: Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.[3]

And it came to pass afterwards, that he traveled through the cities and towns, preaching and evangelizing the kingdom of God; and the twelve with him.

And certain women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities; Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth.[4]

Now it came to pass as they went, that he entered into a certain town; and a certain woman named Martha, received him into her house.

And she had a sister called Mary, who sitting also at the Lord's feet, heard his word.

But Martha was busy about much serving. Who stood and said: Lord, hast thou no care that my sister hath left me alone to serve? speak to her therefore, that she help me.

And the Lord answering, said to her: Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things.

But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.[5]

Jesus therefore six days before the pasch came to Bethania, where Lazarus had been dead, whom Jesus raised to life.

And they made him a supper there: and Martha served, but Lazarus was one of them that were at table with him.

Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of right spikenard, of great price, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

Then one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, he that was about to betray him, said:

Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?

Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the purse, carried the things that were put therein.

Jesus therefore said: Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of my burial.

For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.[6]

And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended all these words, he said to his disciples:

You know that after two days shall be the pasch, and the son of man shall be delivered up to be crucified:

Then were gathered together the chief-priests and ancients of the people into the court of the high priest, who was called Caiphas:

And they consulted together, that by subtilty they might apprehend Jesus, and put him to death.

---

[2] S. Luke vii., 36-50.

[5] S. Luke x., 38-42.

[4] S. Luke viii., 1-2.

[3] S. John xi., 1-3.

[6] S. John xii., 1-8.

But they said: Not on the festival day, lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people.

And when Jesus was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper,

There came to him a woman having an alabaster-box of precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he was at table.

And the disciples seeing it, had indignation, saying: To what purpose is this waste?

For this might have been sold for much, and given to the poor.

And Jesus knowing *it*, said to them: Why do you trouble this woman? For she hath wrought a good work upon me.

For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.

For she in pouring this ointment upon my body, hath done it for my burial.

Amen I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memory of her.[7]

Now the feast of the pasch, and of the azymes was after two days; and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might by some wile lay hold on him, and kill him.

But they said: not on the festival day, lest there should be a tumult among the people.

And when he was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper, and was at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of precious spikenard; and breaking the alabaster box, she poured it out upon his head.

Now there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said: Why was this waste of the ointment made?

For this ointment might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

But Jesus said: Let her alone, why do you molest her? She hath wrought a good work upon me.

For the poor you have always with you: and whensoever you will, you may do them good; but me you have not always.

What she had, she hath done; she is come beforehand to anoint my body for the burial.

Amen, I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memorial of her.[8]

The main question concerns the identity or non-identity of the women here mentioned sometimes anonymously, sometimes under different names. A secondary question, however, and one the solution of which is a necessary preliminary to the solution of the former, is the due chronological arrangement of the various anointings here mentioned. Each of the Evangelists tells us that a woman anointed Our Blessed Lord when He was at table. Were there therefore four, three, two or one anointings? We may begin by classing as one the accounts given by S. Matthew and S. Mark. There is no need of proof of this, for the circumstances are the same both as regards time and place, save only that S. Mark adds the breaking of the box.

The same might be said of the anointing mentioned by S. John in his twelfth chapter, but there are certain definite variations of detail which incline us to think that the fourth Evangelist does not really refer to the same event. The characteristics of the fourth Gospel are familiar. Written some sixty years after Our Lord's Ascension and motived by the errors then prevalent it was yet composed in the light of the Synoptic accounts, and its contents are essentially supplementary to the earlier Gospels already in wide circulation. Bearing this in mind, does it not seem strange that S. John should in the

[7] S. Matthew xxvi., 1-13.

[8] S. Mark xiv., 1-9.

eleventh chapter refer to a previous anointing of Our Blessed Lord (of which more anon), and then proceed to give in his next chapter a detailed account of an incident which was already well known from the Synoptists? We can understand his giving at great length the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand—the only miracle to be found in all four Gospels—because it served as a necessary introduction to Our Lord's teaching on the Holy Eucharist; but for this repetition of the story of the anointing there was no occasion. Moreover, though it may be urged that S. Matthew has no particular regard for the chronological order, this can hardly be said of his account of the last days, more especially of the Sacred Passion. When, then, he begins his twenty-sixth chapter with the definite statement: "He said to His disciples: you know that after *two* days shall be the Pasch," and then proceeds to give the incident of the anointing we have no right to say "No, it was earlier," because S. John says: "Jesus therefore six days before the Pasch came to Bethania . . . and they made Him a supper there."[9] Nor can we retort: "but the six days include the two, and John did not mean that the supper actually too place on that sixth day before the Pasch." We can hardly say this, for S. John immediately after the incident of the anointing adds the story of Christ's entry into Jerusalem from Bethany:

> And on the *next day* a great multitude, that was come to the festival day, when they had heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem,
> Took branches of palm-trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried: Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel.

Moreover, the variations in the accounts themselves as given respectively by S. Mark and S. Matthew on the one hand, and by S. John on the other, are very striking, especially when we bear in mind the supplementary character of S. John's Gospel. Thus S. Matthew tells us that the woman anointed His head, S. John that she anointed His feet; S. Matthew and S. Mark tell us that the banquet took place in the house of Simon the Leper, while S. John would seem to imply that it took place in the home of Lazarus, for Lazarus as His great friend and the subject of the recent miracle "was one of them that were at table with Him," and Martha, as though in her own house, served them, while Mary, also as though in her own house, anointed His feet, thus doing what Simon His earlier host[10] had failed to do.

In the two earlier Gospels there is no mention of Martha or Lazarus, and we are told instead that "when He was in Bethania in the house of Simon the Leper and was at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment. . . ." Surely a very differ-

[9] S. John xii., 1-2.
[10] S. Luke vii., 44.

ent scene from that described in S. John's Gospel. There we have a family scene in the quiet of that home which Jesus loved so well; here, in S. Matthew and S. Mark we feel rather that we are at a public banquet. We notice, moreover, that S. John omits the prophetical words: "Amen, I say to you, wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world that also which she hath done shall be told as a memorial of her."

At the same time we must admit that on the point of this distinction between the accounts of the anointing on the eve of Christ's Passion the weight of authority is against us, and S. Augustine in particular is at pains to identify them.[11]

The question of the identity or non-identity of the anointing described for us by S. Luke with one of the two which immediately preceded Christ's Passion presents far less difficulty.

> And he went into the house of the Pharisee and sat down to meat. And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house brought an alabaster-box of ointment; and standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet and anointed them with the ointment.[12]
>
> [12] S. Luke vii., 36-37.

Time, place and the details of circumstances in the story itself at once mark off this account as distinct from those we have been considering. S. Luke is an historian; he undertakes "to write . . . in order" and he rarely deserts the chronological sequence of events. In his sixth and seventh chapters he relates a series of events which took place between the harvest-time of the second year of the public ministry,

> And it came to pass on the second first sabbath, that as he went through the corn-fields his disciples plucked the ears, and did eat rubbing them in their hands.[13]

and the second circuit of missionary preaching in Galilee.[14] The healing of the man with the withered hand, the choice of the twelve, the Sermon on the Plain, the immediate entrance into Capharnaum,[15] the cure of the centurion's servant, the raising to life of the son of the widow of Naim, all follow in orderly sequence; it is not a collection of miracles or of Divine sayings such as S. Matthew groups together in his ninth and thirteenth chapters. Hence we have no right to argue that the episode of the "woman that was a sinner" is not in its true context of time and place. In other words, there is no reason for holding that it did not take place somewhere in Galilee, Naim if you will, or at Magdala itself, which is not many miles distant, and from which S. Mary Magdalen may have derived her name, and during the second year of the public ministry. The

[11] De Consensu Evangelistarum, lib. ii., cap. clv.
[13] S. Luke vi., 1.
[14] S. Luke viii., 1.
[15] S. Luke vii., 1.

anointing mentioned by the other Evangelists took place in Bethany and at the end of Our Lord's life.

So far, then, we have certainly two, and possibly three, distinct anointings of Our Lord by a woman who in three of the accounts is anonymous, but who is called by S. John "Mary." Two accounts if we class together those given by S. Matthew, S. Mark and S. John; three if we distinguish that of S. John both from that of S. Luke and from those of S. Matthew and S. Mark.

WERE THERE THREE MARYS?

We are now in a position to discuss the main question at issue, namely, whether we are to see one hand or many in this act of love and reverence; whether, that is, we are to carefully distinguish "the sinner" of S. Luke, the unnamed woman of S. Matthew and S. Mark, and the "Mary" of S. John, or whether we are to identify them as one and the same person. We shall have to ask then:

1. Was Mary of Bethany identical with the "sinner" of S. Luke?
2. Was Mary of Bethany also "Mary who is called Magdalen?"
3. Have we, even independently of the two preceding questions, any grounds for saying that: "Mary who is called Magdalen" was the "sinner" of S. Luke?

But we must devote a little space to the Patristic testimony upon the question.

It is commonly affirmed that the Greek and Latin Fathers form two different camps on this point. The Greek Fathers are said to hold the non-identity of these women, while the Latin Fathers as a rule hold that they are one and the same person. The best conspectus of the Patristic evidence on the subject is to be gained from S. Thomas' "Catena Aurea." When commenting on S. Matthew xxvi., 6-13, he gives the following citations from the Fathers:

"*Origen:* Some one may perhaps think that there are four different women of whom the Evangelists have written, but I rather agree with those who think that there are only three; one, of whom Matthew and Mark wrote, one, of whom Luke, another, of whom John.

"*S. Jerome:* For let no one think that she who anointed His head and she who anointed His feet were one and the same, for the latter washed His feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair, and is plainly said to have been a harlot. But of this woman (i. e., in S. Matthew xxvi.) nothing of this kind is recorded, and indeed a harlot could not have at once been made worthy of Our Lord's head.

"*S. Ambrose:* It is possible, therefore, that they were different persons, and so all appearance of contradiction between the Evange-

lists is removed. Or it is possible that it was the same woman at two different times and two different stages of desert, first while a sinner, afterwards more advanced.[16]

"*S. Chrysostom:* And in this way it may be the same in all three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And not without reason does the Evangelists (S. Matthew and S. Mark) mention Simon's leprosy, to shew what gave this woman confidence to come to Christ. The leprosy was an unclean disease; when, then, she saw that Jesus had healed the man with whom He now lodged, she trusted that He could also cleanse the uncleanness of her soul; and so whereas other women came to Christ to be healed in their bodies, she came only for the honour and healing of her soul, having nothing diseased in her body; and for this she is worthy of our highest admiration. But she in John is a different woman, the wonderful sister of Lazarus.[17]

"*Origen:* Matthew and Mark relate that this was done in the house of Simon the Leper; but John says that Jesus came to a house where Lazarus was, and that not Simon, but Mary and Martha served. Further, according to John, six days before the Passover, He came to Bethany, where Mary and Martha made Him a supper. But here (in S. Matthew and S. Mark) it is in the house of Simon the Leper, and two days before the Pasch. And in Matthew and Mark it is the disciples who have indignation with a good intent; in John, Judas alone with intent to steal; in Luke no one finds fault.

"*S. Gregory the Great:* Or we may think that this is the same woman whom Luke calls a sinner and John names Mary.[18]

"*S. Augustine:* Though the action described in Luke is the same as that described here, and the name of him with whom the Lord supped is the same, for Luke also names Simon; yet because it is not contrary to either nature or custom for two men to bear the same name, it is more probable that this was another Simon, not the leper, in whose house in Bethany these things were done. I would only suppose that the woman who on that occasion came near to Jesus' feet, and this woman (in S. Matthew xxvi.) were not two different persons, but that the same Mary did this twice. The first is that narrated by S. Luke; for S. John mentions it in praise of Mary before Christ's coming to Bethany: 'And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.'[19] Mary therefore had done this before. What she did afterwards in Bethany is distinct from

[16] S. Ambrose in Lucae vii., 37.
[17] S. Chrysos., Hom. lxxx.
[18] S. Gregory, Hom. in Evang. xxxiii.
[19] S. John xi., 1.

Luke's account, but is the same event that is recorded by all three, John, Matthew and Mark.[20]

"*Theophylact:* But although the four Evangelists record the anointing by a woman, there were two women and not one; one described by John, the sister of Lazarus; it was she who six days before the Passover anointed the feet of Jesus; another described by the other three Evangelists. Nay, if you examine, you will find three; for one is described by John, another by Luke, a third by the other two. For that one described by Luke is said to have been a sinner, and to have come to Jesus during the time of His preaching; but this other described by Matthew and Mark is said to have come at the time of His Passion, nor did she confess that she had been a sinner.[21]

"*S. Augustine:* I, however, think that nothing else can be meant but that the sinner who then came to the feet of Jesus was no other than the same Mary who did so twice; once as Luke relates it, when coming for the first time with humility and tears she merited the remission of her sins. . . . But what she did again at Bethany is another act unrecorded by Luke, but mentioned in the same way by the other three Evangelists.[22]"[23]

These quotations will suffice to show the varying views which the Fathers have held on the subject, and they serve, moreover, to show us their various modes of exegesis.

But now let us take the Gospel narratives as they stand and see for ourselves what conclusion they point to. And first of all let us examine the Gospels to see whether Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, was the sinner mentioned in S. Luke vii., 37.

If we bear in mind the supplementary character of S. John's Gospel we cannot fail to be struck by the passing note of identification:

> Now there was a certain man sick, named Lazarus, of Bethania, of the town of Mary and of Martha her sister.
> (And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair: whose brother Lazarus was sick.)[24]

To what anointing does this refer? Evidently one well known to his readers. Can it by an anomaly unparalleled in the Gospels refer to the anointing which S. John is *going* to describe in the next chapter? This would seem impossible, and yet non-Catholic commentators who for some unknown reason have a holy horror of identifying Mary of Bethany with the "sinner" do not hesitate to

---

[20] S. Aug., De Consensu Evang. ii., cap. lxxix.
[21] Theoph. in Lucae vii.
[22] S. Aug., De Consensu Evang., lib. ii,. cap. lxxix.
[23] Catena Aurea in S. Matth. et S. Marcum. Oxford.
[24] S. John xi., 1-2.

uphold such an anomalous anticipation on the part of S. John. Thus we read "Mary is apparently put forward as the person best known from the event mentioned in v. 2, and related in ch. xii."[25] Now S. John has many of these parenthetical remarks connecting his subject matter with points well known to his readers, and what is more he is careful to distinguish those which refer to the future from those which refer to the past. Thus vi., 72: "Judas Iscariot . . . the same who *was about to* betray Him." Though the event was past at the time of writing yet S. John was going to give it in detail later on; therefore he refers to it in the future tense; whereas in vii., 50, we find: "Nicodemus said to them (he that came to Him by night)." This referred to the past. If, then, in the passage in dispute S. John is referring by anticipation to the event he is about to describe in the twelfth chapter, he will use the expression, "Who was about to anoint Him," where as a matter of fact we find the past, "who anointed." There is no other well-known anointing then to which the Evangelist could be referring except that in S. Luke vii., "a woman who was in the city, a sinner." And yet what important consequences flow from such an authoritative identification. S. John is talking of Mary of Bethany, and, writing in the light of the Synoptic narrative, knowing therefore that S. Luke had left the sinner nameless, he goes out of his way to clear up a source of obscurity, and on his first mention of Mary the sister of Lazarus adds a note to the effect that she is to be identified with the woman who had previously anointed the Lord's feet. Such an identification, which may be classed as "authentic," i. e., Scripture interpreting Scripture, cannot be met by a mere "the confession of Mary of Bethany with a notorious sinner by Luke, who knows the character of Mary is scarcely credible."[26] Nor again is it sufficient to reject the identification by saying: "The chief objection is the irreconcilable difference between Mary of Bethany and the sinner."[27] The words quoted above from S. Ambrose are sufficient answer to such difficulties: "It is possible that it was the same woman at two different times and two different stages of desert, first while a sinner, afterwards more advanced."

Nor again we see any difficulty in S. Luke's description of the household at Bethany:

> Now it came to pass as they went, that he entered into a certain town; and a certain woman named Martha, received him into her house.
>
> And she had a sister called Mary, who sitting also at the Lord's feet, heard his word.
>
> But Martha was busy about much serving. Who stood and said: Lord, hast thou no care that my sister hath left me alone to serve? speak to her therefore, that she help me.

[25] Westcott on S. John xi., 1-2. Speaker's Commentary.

[26] International Critical Commentary. Plummer, S. Luke vii., p. 209.

[27] Ibid.

And the Lord answering, said to her: Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things.
But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.[28]

Surely there is such a thing as forgiven sin, and what more fitting attitude for the forgiven sinner could be suggested than that here portrayed? This incident is indeed the Divine fulfilment of the Divine promise:

Come to me, all you that labour, and are burdened, and I will refresh you.
Take up my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek, and humble of heart: and you shall find rest to your souls.
For my yoke is sweet and my burden light.[29]

It has, however, been urged with some show of reason that Mary must have been above suspicion, for S. John tells us that "many of the Jews were come to Martha and Mary to comfort them concerning their brother," a thing which they would not have done if Mary were the "woman that was in the city a sinner." And in conjunction with this it is urged that whereas Mary came from Bethany, the "sinner" came from Galilee. The second objection supplies the answer to the first; it is precisely because Bethany had not been the scene of her evil courses, but far off Galilee, that Mary had been received amongst the Jews and not scorned as the Pharisee scorned her in Galilee. And an examination of the Greek text of S. John xi., 1, shows us that such a change of residence on the part of the family of Bethany as is here implied is really signified by the Evangelist. We should be inclined to render the passage: "Now there was a certain man sick named Lazarus, who came from Bethany (i. e., was dwelling there at the moment), but was sprung from the village of Mary and Martha," thus implying that he was now sojourning in Bethany, he and his sisters had once lived elsewhere, but had changed their residence.[30]

If we may now consider Mary of Bethany identical with the "sinner" of S. Luke, can we find in the Gospel any hint that Mary of Bethany was S. Mary Magdalen? We have learned from S. John that it was Mary of Bethany who anointed Our Lord six days before the Pasch, and there is no reason to suppose that S. Matthew and S. Mark, though they mention no name, refer to any one else in their account of the anointing which took place two days before the Pasch, especially if we agree to consider these three accounts as all referring to one event, as most commentators do.

Now, of that woman who S. John tells us was Mary of Bethany, Our Lord said: "Let her alone that she may keep it against the

[28] S. Luke x., 38-42.
[29] S. Matth. xi., 28-30.
[30] Westcott, "Speaker's Comment. on S. John," agrees with this rendering of the Greek text.

day of My burial;"[31] and of S. Mary Magdalen we read: "Mary Magdalen, and Mary of James, and Salome, brought sweet spices, that coming they might anoint Jesus."[32] May we not agree to see in the second passage the literal application of the first? And how pointless the answer of Our Lord reads unless it be read in the light of the second!

Again, of that same woman it was said: "Amen I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done shall be told for a memorial of her."[33] The Divine prophecy must needs have been fulfilled, and it would almost seem as if S. John had this thought in his mind when he went out of the way to tell us who that woman was, namely, Mary the sister of Lazarus, and she who had some time previously won the pardon of a life of sin by tearfully anointing her Saviour's feet in Galilee, as told us by S. Luke. If the prophecy was to be fulfilled we must know who she was, and S. John has provided for that, and how has the Church and history understood him? By identifying S. John's "Mary of Bethany" with S. Mary Magdalen, "out of whom seven devils were gone forth." But does the Gospel anywhere hint that Mary Magdalen was the "sinner" mentioned by S. Luke?

Before discussing this point it may be as well to draw attention to another passage in S. Luke. In his account of Our Lord's call of S. Matthew we read:

> And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom, and he said to him: Follow me.
> And leaving all things, he rose up and followed him.
> And Levi made him a great feast in his own house; and there was a great company of publicans, and of others, that were at table with them.[34]

Contrast this with S. Matthew's own account of his conversion:

> And when Jesus passed on from thence, he saw a man sitting in the custom-house, named Matthew; and he saith to him: Follow me. And he rose up and followed him.[35]

If we were examining some classic work by a pagan author we should be ready enough to recognize the extreme delicacy with which S. Luke veils S. Matthew's identity, and the equal humility with which the quondam publican openly avows the nature of his former avocation. The historian Natalis Alexander drew attention to this point and dwelt upon it as illustrative of S. Luke's character.

Let us now put side by side two other passages from S. Luke:

> And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster-box of ointment;
> And standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with tears, and

[31] S. John xii., 7.
[32] S. Mark xvi., 1.
[33] S. Mark xiv., 9.
[34] S. Luke v., 27-29.
[35] S. Matth. ix., 9.

wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

And the Pharisee, who had invited him, seeing it, spoke within himself, saying: This man, if he were a prophet, would know surely who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

* * * * * *

And (Jesus) turning to the woman, he said unto Simon: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she with tears hath washed my feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them.

Thou gavest me no kiss; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but she with ointment hath anointed my feet.

Wherefore I say unto thee: Many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much. But to whom less is forgiven, he loveth less.

And he said to her: Thy sins are forgiven thee.

And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

And he said to the woman: Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace.[36]

Immediately upon which follows: "And it came to pass afterwards that He tavelled through the cities and towns preaching and evangelizing the kingdom of God; and the twelve with Him; and certain women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, *Mary who is called Magdalen,* out of whom seven devils were gone forth."[37]

Is it too much to say that this is a veiled identification of Mary with the sinner just mentioned? Add to this that Magdala was a town not far from Naim where the incident immediately preceding the conversion of the sinner took place. May not Our Blessed Lord have passed from Naim to Magdala where perhaps Mary was leading her sinful life and whence she probably derived her name? Venerable Bede considers Magdala to have been the scene of her conversion, and two Greek travelers are quoted as having seen in Magdala the house wherein the "Magdalen's" sins were forgiven.

It is easy to urge that Mary Magdalen, who was possessed by seven devils, can hardly have led the life commonly attributed to the "sinner," but surely it is equally easy to retort that this possession may well be a metaphorical expression for the evil passions which held her in bondage.

Again, it should be noticed that S. Luke's introduction of Mary Magdalen is, in his eyes, saved from all note of abruptness by the remark, "Out of whom seven devils were gone forth." This was to identify her, even though in a veiled manner. Up to now he has not mentioned her by name, but he has spoken of her; on the contrary, he has not spoken of Joanna, and therefore he tells us who she was, "the wife of Herod's steward."

To sum up, then, we have endeavored to show from the Gospels themselves, independently of any tradition, the truth of that tradition which the Church cherishes, that tradition which runs through

[36] St. Luke vii., 37-50.

[37] S. Luke viii., 1-2.

every line of the Breviary Office for the Feast of S. Mary Magdalen, which makes the quondam "sinner" the gentle Mary of Bethany, and finally the "Apostle of the Apostles" after the Resurrection.

Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, was the "sinner" mentioned by S. Luke, for S. John identifies them for us. Mary of Bethany was also Mary who is called Magdalen, for it is only such an identification that can explain the Divine words: "Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of My burial,"[38] and "Wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done shall be told for a memorial to her."[39]

And, lastly, the "sinner" was "Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth," and S. Luke's charity has skilfully veiled the identification.

A very brief history of S. Mary Magdalen, drawn only from the Gospel story, will help to make our view clearer.

In the second year of Our Lord's ministry, when He was in Galilee, he passed through the village of Naim, and there at the gate he revived the widow's only son to life, passing from thence to Magdala, as is at least probable, he dined with the Pharisee and called the "sinner" Mary, the sister of Lazarus, to a better way of life. Thus S. Luke in his seventh chapter. In his next chapter he tells us of the women who supported Our Lord out of their substance, and amongst them he enumerates "Mary who is called Magdalen," this as we have seen reason to suppose being derived from the scene of her disorderly life; He who "came not to call the just but sinners," and who rejoiced to be called "the Friend of . . . sinners" graciously permitted her to follow Him and minister to Him. After a while she returns to her brother and sister and they take up their residence at Bethany, where Jesus comes to visit them, "and Mary sat at His feet" and heard the words of the Divine Consoler: "Mary hath chosen the best part which shall not be taken away from her."

A year and more passes and the time of the S. Passion draws nigh. Jesus comes to Jerusalem and raises Lazarus from the dead. Again, six days before the Pasch, He comes to Bethany, and they make Him a feast in the house of Lazarus, and Martha waits upon them. Then Mary, mindful of a former occasion, anoints His feet and wipes them with her hair. Again, two days before the Pasch, He is entertained at supper by Simon the Leper, and again "a certain woman," whom we hold to be Mary the sister of Lazarus, who had anointed Him but four days before, and the same with the

[38] S. John xii., 7.
[39] S. Mark xiv., 9.

"sinner" who had come trembling to His feet more than a year ago, comes in, and with a livelier confidence she now not only anoints His feet but His head, and as S. Mark tells us, she broke the vase that none of the precious ointment might fail of its purpose.

Lastly, she "to whom many sins had been forgiven because she loved much," and who had "done this for His burial," completes her repentance (surpassing all the Apostles in her love and devotion) by that three hours' watch at the foot of the Cross, and by her many visits to the tomb wherein she had seen Him laid. Her love and her constancy were fitly rewarded for (first after His Blessed Mother) she merited to behold her Risen Lord.

HUGH POPE, O. P.

Rugeley, England.

DES CARTES AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

AMONG the early acts of the Constituent Assembly was a resolution in the nature of a decree declaring that its presence was the realization of Des Cartes' philosophical principles. Doubtless a year or two later the men there would, in their fine Roman manner, vote that he deserved well of the Republic. The Revolution did not begin with the Republic, it began with the overthrow of the orders of the clergy and nobility. It is not ended yet. If any one doubts that the Revolution is still alive, that the volcano is still burning, that the conflict is still being waged between the elements of security and order and the forces of anarchy, the utterances of M. Combes and his predecessor should have put an end to the doubt. We declare, as these men themselves have declared, that they are revolutionists vested with authority, enemies of law clothed with the powers of the state. Proscription is not a policy of settled government. When M. M. Combes and Waldeck Rousseau deprived certain of the religious orders of individual and corporate rights, they attacked the wide interests represented by members of the orders. They say they have suppressed these bodies in accordance with the principles of 1789. This is hardly sufficient; they mean the principles of the Revolution, the principles of public robbery, wholesale proscription, and if practicable, wholesale massacre entered into in 1879. In attacking the religious orders, they invaded the religious and moral rights of every man, woman and child in the State. To suppress a religious order is not

the same thing as to dissolve a fraudulent commercial enterprise. No, and what is more, these men would not dissolve a swindling company as long as its promoters bribed them. The confiscation of the goods and estates of the religious orders may supply the means of filling up the deficit in the Treasury.

In a letter dated from Frohsdorf, in 1872, Henry V. declares that the legislation then about being inaugurated against the parent's right to determine the teaching he desired for his children, was one of the signs that his country was rushing "to the abyss." The person to whom he wrote the letter was one of those Catholic gentlemen still to be found in France, and who in their lives and principles maintain the traditions which made her emphatically "the great nation." They are men to be feared and hated by the base and unscrupulous; and it is against such men in reality that the paltry rabble of legislators enact disabilities when they proscribe religious orders. Monks and nuns are in themselves nothing; they can bear penalties with resignation or welcome them with enthusiasm, but it is the awful rights of God over His people that are taken away when the monk and the nun are imprisoned or banished or degraded from their character as religious. France is back to the eighteenth century when the *philosophe* said with the fool: there is no God.

Every act of the Revolution from its birth was an attack on interests and rights. The first movement in the States General, in 1879, was a lawless rising of the *Tiers Etat* against the other orders and the King. They represented twenty-five millions, they said, the other orders only represented the clergy and nobility. This view is commonly accepted as their justification. It is not true. The clergy from their office had the deepest interest in the material welfare of the people. Men charged with religious and moral responsibilities with regard to every individual life cannot divest themselves of a concern for whatever affects that life. The priest is not only the teacher and director in the highest interests, he is the sympathizing friend in all other interests. Had the parish priest of the eighteenth century in a life devoted to his people from the cradle to the grave, who watched over each one and spent himself for each one, less regard for the comfort of his people than M. La Mettrie, whose philosophical principles were the reflex of his abominable life? than Helvetius, who, in his practice and in his precept, was one of the thousand whom our Burke included in his scornful classification of sophists, economists and calculators, and with all of whom the object of social intercourse was to realize the atrocious sentiment—"Il n'y a de bon dans d'amour que la physiqúe?" So far for the clergy.

Had the middle class no powers in the state? Remember, the

Tiers Etat was elected from the middle class, merchants of the great towns, wealthy shopkeepers and tradesmen of the other towns, lawyers in troops, doctors of medicine, writers; and remember, that all of them, tradesman or publicist, loved virtue with his lips and posed as a *philosophe* each according to his degree. Not one of them but could give to the other proofs of equality, like the barber who piaffed his remonstrance to a supercilious customer: "Sir, I may be only a miserable barber, but I would have you know that I have no more belief in God than the best of you."

Now, from immemorial time, certainly from the eighth century, the middle class exercised in the Communes functions identical with those conferred on county councils and urban councils in England some dozen years ago. Their grievances were nothing more than the effects of a jealousy we allow to be natural. At the same time, in the towns and villages even, there were persons reckoned of this class who could claim any privileges of the nobility, despite their unpatrician birth. This was the sore that rankled. A manufacturer with rights of compelling labor in virtue of some land his grandfather had purchased from an out-at-elbows owner, with the privilege of prefixing "de" to his name, and so on, withered under the blank stare of a seigneur as poor as Job and as badly mounted as Don Quixote.

When the National Assembly, calling itself the Constituent Assembly, after usurping the powers of the other orders, set about business, they decreed their homage to Des Cartes. With all his anxiety to work for his people they made the poor King a roi faineant. This is not all. The latest canard about the princes who had crossed the frontier and the other emigrés caused a deputation to be sent him. One need not be sentimental to feel for the outraged majesty of the King, to think with our Burke that ten thousand swords should have leaped from their scabbards at the sight of the Queen's tears of humiliation for the husband that she loved. The slightest thing caused a furious debate, mouthing orators threatening this, that and the other, if some one spoke of the Pope's disapproval of the robbery of the church and the releasing of priests and religious from their vows; or said that Monsieur intended going to Vienna, or the Count De Artois was stirring up intrigues at Turin, or that the sovereigns agreed that the King was a prisoner. Having discussed alternatives to their satisfaction—such as suspension of powers, deposition, trial for the newly enacted crime of treason against the nation—at this stage—they would send another message to the King, headed by "*the virtuous Bailly*" perhaps, and consisting of a hundred *virtuous* men besides; later on embassies to the King became warnings to "the hereditary representative." Yet

this legislative anarchy decreed the apotheosis of Des Cartes. They sat in their own estimation as the triumph of his principles, they were the vital expression and embodiment of that intellectual liberty he proclaimed, the visible sign of the power of truth to subdue those who would put fetters on the mind.

All this was, of course, madness and dreaming. They were a confusion of primordial units—unlike the atoms revolving in the vortices of Des Cartes, for these obeyed laws in their path or their aberrations, but units flung from the hand of a maleficent power as elements of everlasting anarchy. Or, if you like, with the State and the church prostrate round them, they resembled Bedouins among the broken arches and the fallen columns of a desert city watching for the caravan they were to attack. If Des Cartes could have come to the scene and could hear the orating and perorating about him, if he could see the fat waistcoats of the Plain filled with emotion and its eyes melting into its six hundred pocket handkerchiefs, if he could gaze on the stern virtue of the Left and the sterner virtue of the extreme Left, Romans all, he would conclude that the daemon who had troubled his studies in life, now stronger in his death, was moving the madmen there to enfold him with the robe of derision and crown him with the diadem of a fool.

There was a method in their madness for all that we have been saying, they could have put Voltaire in the place of honor if they had any regard for consistency. No one had a better title to their worship than the man in whom their own vices had attained a magnitude almost preternatural, whose principles possessed a comprehensive development to which their own great, but still limited baseness could not reach. He had philosophized mendacity into the principle of conduct—they could observe this precept to the letter. His ordinary acts proceeded from a congenital and vehement malignity. The three acts of his long life that appear to have been dictated by a spirit of justice were inspired by hatred of the laws and the men that administered them. He was keen to take advantage of accidental defects in institutions, when the doing so would serve the cause of disorder. In his old age he writes to his niece to procure for the decoration of Ferney the most obscene pictures she could find. His detestation of whatever was worthy of reverence, his scorn of all that had a place in the heart from the associations of virtue, the example of good men and women, the influences of the home of childhood, point him out as the tutelary deity of a legislature whose business was the resolution of the moral elements of the world to chaos. In their own writings the *philosophes* of the Assembly, as their predecessors had done, held up chastity as a sin against nature, the self-denial of Christianity as the offering of

ignorance to superstition, self-effacement, self-sacrifice for the benefit of others as a blasphemy against reason. In these conclusions of intellectual animalism Voltaire was their model and ought to have been consecrated as the object of their adoration.

Or, it may have been, that the apotheosis of Des Cartes had its origin in that felicitous irony of mental processes with which experts in the psychosis of insanity are familiar. The madman who suspects the doctor has come to examine him displays a coherence of thought, a clearness of statement, a plausibility in accounting for acts needing explanation that baffles the judgment. On some such principle we may understand the policy which guided this collective wisdom in dedicating themselves to the genius of philosophy in the person of Des Cartes. He was a Catholic, and though his intellectual dominion had gone down before the advance of English materialism in philosophy, the qualified atheism of the Deist in religion, the revolutionary liberalism of the Whig in politics, it could not be altogether forgotten that for a time his metaphysical and natural science was supreme in the whole world of thought, and therefore, they resolved under the appearance of homage to decree him infamous.

They were fond of classical models, they were instinct with the humanism that fell on France in the reign of Amurath, commonly called Francis I., as an enervating influence on the mind, as a passionate incitement to the heart. They knew that the Greeks and Romans dedicated shrines and temples to the infernal powers, to the fates that are inexorable, to the deities that preside over the offices of hate and revenge and lawless love, to theft and to the clerkliness that provides documentary evidence for the false friend, the grasping relative, the fraudulent trustee: so the Constituent Assembly in erecting its altar may have hoped to gratify the worshipers of Voltaire and Rousseau, d'Holbach and d'Alembert, Condorcet, Diderot, and all the other Gods of the revolutionary pantheon by sealing with the ignominy of its reverence, the great intellect that had in spite of speculative mistakes been always faithful to the Church.

This is no fanciful idea of ours. Not one particle of influence was possessed by Des Cartes' ideas during the eighteenth century. The sensationalism of Bacon, Hobbes and Locke was the *fons et origo* of every speculation on morals, on laws and society whether the thinker like Codillac says everything, even instinct, is acquired, or like Cabanis that thought is a secretion of the brain, or like Condorcet and d'Alembert that religion is the power that opposes the progress of mankind. It is the very industry of a malice which finds in Des Cartes' initial rule of evidence the source of eighteenth cen-

tury philosophy and the cataclysm to which that philosophy so much contributed.

The initial principle of the Cartesian system may be taken, if you like, as a challenge to authority, but it must be limited by Des Cartes' own words and by his own application of the method. Nothing is to be accepted on authority alone, even if backed by the name of Aristotle. This is his dictum. English philosophers at once cry out that he is the Luther of philosophy, that he is full of the spirit of the Renascence and the Reformation, that he is above all others animated by the ideas and energies of those movements and that in a more decided sense than Bacon he is the leader of modern thought. We at once concede his immeasurable superiority to Bacon. We see in this no impeachment of St. Thomas' philosophy. So far as this was a vehicle of theological definition and deduction there could be no conceivable attack upon it in the dictum cited; for Des Cartes in the most express terms excluded theological questions and necessarily the philosophy linked to speculation about such questions from the application of the rule. He knew that on the data supplied by Revelation the deepest problems affecting man's destiny had been thought over with a severity of reasoning, a penetration of analysis, a rapid perception of relations and a formative power not equaled in the Academy, or the Portico, or any ancient school. The only man among the ancients who could have single-handed attempted the construction of such a science as theology had become was Aristotle. The man that resembled him most among the schoolmen was St. Thomas certainly, but there had been and there were great doctors and great thinkers in every part of Europe constantly adding to the fabric. Before St. Thomas' time the whole range of human knowledge had been classified; and the coördination of science we are presented with by Bacon in the *De Agumentis* was in conformity with the arrangement in the schools.

The influence of Aristotle had been swept away, except in the Protestant theological seminaries which still in Des Cartes' time followed Aristotle in natural science, in metaphysical and in moral science. Investigation in natural science in Catholic seminaries and universities had been sapping the conclusions drawn from the physics of Aristotle ever since Roger Bacon's tremendous philippic in the *Compendium Studii Philosophiæ* published in 1271. It is very well worth noticing that the Frior Bacon has anticipated in the *Opus Tertium* his Elizabethan namesake in much that is valuable in the latter's views of experimental science and that he gives an investigation into the nature and cause of the rainbow which is described as a fine example of inductive research. But as to Francis Bacon's

inductive method it could only be employed when the investigator was already in full possession of the facts and the laws to be discovered.[1]

This is the clear force of the dependence of the *Organum* on a complete natural history for its utility. We are entitled to say that when Des Cartes rejected the authority of Aristotle, he did so only with regard to physics; or, at least, that he did not mean to question the authority of St. Thomas with regard to metaphysical problems or even the testimony of introspection concerning the operations of the mind. It may be objected that his psychology is essentially different from St. Thomas'. We submit that the difference is accidental rather than essential. He did not suppose that cerebration was the cause of thought, but was the concomitant of thought. It may be that he was an idealist in the modern sense, but we shall defer this question until we come to deal with one or two metaphysical problems around which the principal controversy on his philosophy has centred.

Besides this misinterpreted challenge to authority on which the Constitutent Assembly may have based its homage, the pretensions of persons calling themselves disciples of Des Cartes to have acted on his principles may have afforded additional appearance of warrant for the resolution. Montesquieu ostentatiously professed to follow him in the domain of political philosophy; and he did so by applying the method of geometry to speculations on society. As a philosophic tract *L'Esprit des Lois* is of little value; as an instance of the futility of employing the wrong method in a department of research it is invaluable. The postulate at the head of his speculations is that man is the creator of society. In this he was followed by the whole tribe of *philosophes*, and the result is the chaos that still prevails.

With Des Cartes, God is the source of all moral and material existences; not as an initial force but a creative intelligence and power; not by the starting of germinal elements, but by the perfect creation of everything one by one, from suns to the creatures whose universe is a drop of water. We fancy our readers will think we are writing under the influence of a lying spirit, that we are driving back Des Cartes to the principles of the Monastery school for the coloni, lidi and slaves of a rural circonscription in the sixth century, that we are forgetting his theory of vortices which roused to madness the Lutheran divines and professors in Holland.

All this, however, shall be presented before we are done. Admitting, in all the fullness claimed by the most advanced admirers of

[1] It is very remarkable that Roger Bacon in what he calls "*offendicula*" has anticipated the later Bacon's doctrine of the *Idola*.

Des Cartes in the present day, that his theory of the universe is so much a result of mechanical force as not to need the agency of a Creator to explain the phenomena of figure and motion, admitting that when he reached his irreducible point of extension as the essential difference of matter, admitting that he did so to take shelter in a dualism in conflict with his principles: still we say that he only intended this as a method of instruction and that he constantly appeals to God as the Creator of all things and of every single thing. Not an organism but has come from His hands in the beginning. Now if society be an organism it must on Des Cartes' own principles have come from God. He speaks of the "blundering humours" of those who seek change for the sake of change, he expresses supreme contempt for what we call political and social reformers who are perpetually in the search of novelties not from a sense of their necessity but because they are new. We doubt very much could a better estimate of the *philosophes* of the century of Revolution be found. We doubt whether the *philosophes* in the Constitutent Assembly could be more happily described; we shrewdly suspect that those virtuous men knew of the opinion and accordingly that like Voltaire they must have hated him in their souls.

Even at the risk of wearying our readers we must add that in the mental and moral world Des Cartes has God so prominently in view that He is always present. He is not merely Author of the intellectual and moral world but its Guardian over every process of thought and dictate of conscience. So much is this the case that Malebranche draws from it his beautiful but somewhat dangerous philosophy of the "Vision of God." Spinoza draws from it the illimitable expansion, the fathomless depth of uncreated Being of which the countless seeming shapes that fill the universe are modes. Society then as a moral entity must have proceeded from God on Cartesian principles.

All the young men in the National Assembly, even the greater part of the young nobles, were badly tainted by the stupidities of Rousseau which were called beautiful sentiments and the sarcasms of Voltaire which were regarded as the criticisms of a powerful and penetrating mind. Belonging to the *Tiers Etat* were many Bourgeois' of that type made immortal as the "*Gentilhomme*" more than a hundred years before by Moliére. These were more under the dominion of Rousseau's sentiments even than of the destructive criticisms of Voltaire. In 1789 the air was vibrating with sound and movement. The bourgeoisie wanted change; they were philosophical and virtuous and like Cæsar were ambitious.

Some idea of needs and their appeasement had passed into the minds of the peasantry as a spirit may enter into the adamant of the

mountains, as the spoken thought may echo amid the savage rocks; so they felt in almost inarticulate ways that the good King in calling the Estates would give them food, take off the siegneur's chains of labor, remove the nation's load of taxes from their backs. In such ways the seeds called ideas sometimes germinate and the ambition of the bourgeoisie knew how to make them grow portentiously in the peasants' slowly receptive minds.

Those *philosophes* of court and town and village could trade on sad and awful memories too. There is a sympathy of passionate feeling which may be roused by declamation when memories coalesce with experiences. We are not heedless of the grievances of the people. We say that the Revolution was brought about, at least in part, by men who had no grievances of their own but who were fired by jealousy and ambition. These used the poor peasants' vague sense of something out of joint to madden them with the idea that they were wronged. There was not a shade of oppression on account of religion at the time, yet the declaimers led the South to believe that they were back to the dragonnades,[2] that it was one and the same power devoured the peasants' substance, and sent the horseman to scatter the prayer meetings of the Huguenots. So the Catholic peasants were fired against a religious persecution that was imaginary, fired to break the chains of persons freer than themselves.

In fact there were comparatively few Huguenots at all and hardly any of them were peasants. The lower classes of them were village tradesmen or tradesmen in the larger towns, and so well was the pretence of the cruelty of their wrongs agitated in commune and commune, parish and parish, that a proportion was sent to the States General greatly in excess of what their numbers and stake in the country warranted. Nor is the motive of this far to seek. The bourgeois' who ought to have been Catholics had become atheists. Political and social ambition was their passion. They knew that the Huguenot deputies would be irreconcilable and therefore invaluable in the conflict to be provoked against the clergy and nobility. It was no regard for religious liberty that moved them; or if it were any such principle, it was the liberty that suppressed the Jesuits, that was about to suppress all the religious orders, that was about to send priests in shoals to the prisons, to hang priests from the lamp-posts and hunt them like wild beasts, to offer them as hecatombs under the guillotine to the goddess of reason and the ideas called liberty, fraternity, equality, that was about to shut up the Churches and cut

---

[2] Louis XIV. was a Gallican, not a Catholic. The Huguenots have no ground to quarrel with Catholics, but Catholics were wronged by them.

off the heads of men and women suspected, or accused of desiring to follow the religion in which they had been born.

The only grievances existing in France were on certain badly managed estates. The resident landlords were humane and considerate towards their peasants, but their haughtiness to "the intelligent middle class" was an inexpiable crime. On the estates of those nobles who had thronged the purlieus of the Court from the time of Louis XIV. until the time of the Revolution the degradation of the people was beyond description. The relatives of the great man and his *intendant*, ruled the district. These stood between the peasant and the sun, huge figures filling the space between the earth and sky, terrible in their anger, more terrible in the license that would invade the sacred treasures which gave to the poor man's hut the only light in life. These lordlings did what they willed, they are compared to the powers of nature that Kings' armies cannot stay, to the wind and the rain, the frost and snow, the wild lightning, they are compared to fate inevitable, irresistible; and so, upon such estates gaunt pôverty walked dull eyed to the grave. Why, so insane was the pride of the great man's relatives, all nobles of course, that the peasants dared not put out manure on their crops lest the game should take a relish not acceptable to lordly palates.

We are not surprised that interested disturbers of the peace would inflame their minds; make them think it was better to rise up and destroy chateaux and out-buildings, terrify and have revenge even though death should find them at the work; than like dumb beasts to live their lives of half-hunger and all hopelessness waiting for the grave.

For what these creatures in their madness might do we have no word but one of pity. If they thought in their unchained anger they "saw" better by hanging priests and nobles from the lamp-posts we say God pity them. Our quarrel is with the smug bourgeois Gentil-homme for whom the Sixth and Seventh Commandments had been repealed, who talked of equality to those creatures and took a fit if any of them touched his coat of "incroyable" cut, whose heart expanded with fraternity for negroes in San Domingo, but never gave a sou to poverty in his district; never gave anything that could be construed into an act of benevolence until when as a deputy of the Constituent he voted other men's money to the Paris rabble to insult the King and Queen and to murder those enemies of the human race, the priest and the aristocrat. It is not with the poor peasants we quarrel, it is with the shameless bourgeois lawyer, doctor, journalist or shopkeeper who spoke of humanity, benevolence and virtue as ideas possessing his most distinguished consideration; and yet could denounce to the tribunal the daughter of some

prisoner who would not buy with her dishonor her father's liberty or life. It is with him in the name of ruined France, of violated justice, of outraged God we quarrel. It is he who has profited by the Revolution, it is he who rules and dishonors France to-day.

None of these philosophical effects could have preceded from the works of Des Cartes; what relation is there between the principles of the *philosophes* and the broken ends of atoms shot from the centre of a vortex and constituting a firmament? Let us test by results. Des Cartes had been put upon the shelf by these gentlemen; but their principles are very definitely expressed in September massacres, the unimaginable horrors of the Comtat-Venaissin approved, if not inspired, by the Girondists, the red carnival of the Paris Terror, the Terror in the provinces when the night skies were illuminated by flaming villages and castles, when the roads looked as though the fierce mercenaries of the days of English invasion had passed from the number of the dead of both sexes of every period of life from infancy to old age.

Let it be understood distinctly that Des Cartes placed religion, the only religion he had in view, his own, on a plane above the meddling of *philosophe* or amateur, assuming that there can be a distinction in the eighteenth century between the words at all. The *philosophe* of that time, when he was not a scarecrow, of the author species such as we have hold of in Gil Blas' dinner was a dapper, petit maitrish kind of thinking man, free of salons and marble halls. He could tell women of fashion as they stood on high-heeled shoes under the snow castles erected by their perruquiers, that morals were matters of convention largely dependent on the meridian for their validity, that society was an exchange of concession as proved in *L'Esprit des Lois* in such an interesting manner by mathematics and the inductive process invented by Milor Bacon. Religion except natural religion, he would say, which every one found in the heart, putting his hand on that region—the heart alas! discovered to be a force-pump by the illustrious Englishman Harvey, religion had ceased to exist, ecclesiastical or ceremonial religion was priestcraft. The church, however, as an institution was excellent as it provided bishoprics and rich abbeys for the younger sons of great families. This twaddle heard in the salons of such ladies, ladies, ladies as the fair d'Epinay and de Tencin and the charmers of the *Encyclopedia*, could not be regarded as other than sound doctrine in faith and morals. Women who had sons or nephews fit for nothing on earth but to receive the income of rich abbeys or dioceses found this consistent with the Social Contract, that new Gospel of Mme. De Waren's protegé.

Before we conclude this article which is not intended to be an

examination of Des Cartes' philosophy much less of his influence on modern thought, there are one or two points we desire to suggest. We have implied that his principles had no authority on those who are immediately responsible for the Revolution. Their views were taken from the English thinkers of the sensational school, views which in them at least constituted a frank materialism. We do not think all of the *philosophes* were convinced materialists. There were men like Condillac, that man forever on guard against his conscience,[3] who took it up as the cult of good society which ever since the Regency had been dancing its minuets of irreverence and immorality until at the end of the Well-beloved's reign there was hardly any man of social position with courage to avow belief in Christianity; hardly a woman so unfashionable as to admit a respect for virtue. Remember, that the men—we care not if they were the descendants of Crusaders—were the lackeys of the King's mistresses, that the women, with few exceptions, had so far forgotten themselves as to pay court to each Vice-Queen as her star arose. There were men like La Mettrie to whom a fat, rank materialism was the adjustment of the intellectual atmosphere to human nature, that is, to appetite, a relation of action and reaction such as we have in that profound *Durivinian* novelty, old as *Plato's Republic* and the *Politics* of Aristotle—which is called the effect of environment. There were men like Condorcet, so religious or conscientious in their apostolate of iniquity that whilst they affected in their published writings a respect for decency in language, a regard for the Christian religion and the moral code it sanctioned, were most industriously disseminating in anonymous pamphlets and in social intercourse principles of conduct so hideous in their grossness, so savage in their lawlessness that one might be excused for thinking it all a satire or burlesque.

Here indeed we have effects of the spirit of the Renascence, here as in Italy in the last half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth, when the spirit of liberty died with the spirit of religion, with chastity, with the spirit of the giving up of all for Christ. The callous insolence and inexpressible viciousness of the Italian scholar and his pupil who was to be one of the tyrants of the land, we have here in France during the century in which the Revolution burst forth, to appal, terrify and yet to vindicate the laws of God to man. When Professor Caird speaks of Des Cartes as being full of the spirit of the Renascence, he forgets the latter's contempt for what is called scholarship.[4] To him what are spoken of as "the

[3] So de Maistre speaks of him.

[4] Des Cartes lost all interest in the Princess Palatine when he heard she was learning Greek.

fair humanities of old religion" would have no meaning, to him the paganism that could see a religion through the hazes of classic imagination, through the lights and shadows of the fancy in the pillars of some Ionic temple by the sea, in the classic groups on the foreground, and in a long procession headed by the garland crowned oxen and the sacrificing priest coming from the twilight of a forest glade into the sunlight of the temple space, to him such fantasy would be the madness of midsummer.

There is no comparison between the war carried on against religion in France and the criticisms of the unbelievers of whom Plato speaks. These are intelligible, but the propagandism of the *philosophe* could only have its inspiration from hell; it was a phase of the war against religion that in one form or another, and with varying degrees of activity had been going on in France for a century and a half before the Revolution. Even the genius of Bossuet could not arrest the ideas of the Libertines on their way; and we strongly suspect that his ominous prediction as to the religious and moral conflicts to arise from Des Cartes' principles sprang from his sense of the use the Libertines might make of them, rather than from any intrinsic evil they possessed. Bossuet and Fenelon both considered that Cartesianism could be reconciled with Christianity, that is to say, that the metaphysics of Des Cartes could be employed as an instrument of Christian thought, as the metaphysical ideas of Plato had been by the Fathers and the mental and moral philosophy of Aristotle by their successors. It would be the merest childishness to think that in a matter of this kind the Eagle of Meaux could be so utterly mistaken as to deem it possible that a philosophy of universal scepticism could be the vehicle of theological explanations and deductions.

This being so we ask: Is the initial rule of evidence the position of a sceptic? If what is stated as its effect be true, knowledge is a dream. But that it is the position of a sceptic we deny even though the charge is advanced by Hume. It is a simple abuse of language to call that a fundamental doubt which was only intended to open the door to certitude. To make a major and a minor the premises of a conclusion materially different from what they contain can only happen by bad reasoning. We propose an illustration of bad logic in the following: Whoever thinks, knowing the mendacity of his faculties, exists according to their testimony, but the faculties are liars when they tell me I exist, therefore I certainly exist. This is substantially the process into which an intuition is broken up in order to bury Des Cartes among the ruins of his system.

The whole philosophical system must be looked at in order to arrive at the meaning of this so-called doubt. We readily admit

that in the history of what he calls his great conception there is something like an impeachment of the veracity of all our sources of information. No one has ever criticized Locke for comparing the mind to a *tabula rasa*—though we decidedly deny that the mind is a blank paper on which automatous long pens called sensations and an automatous short pen called reflexion write hieroglyphics. Then why criticize Des Cartes' initial doubt? Is it fair?

Des Cartes believed in the creation as the belief is stated in the Creeds, believed in it as he was taught to believe when a little child. At the same time he considered himself as offering no disrespect to faith when he presents in an analytical instruction the mode by which we might understand something of the nature and properties of the organic and inorganic universe. "But yet as it is best," he says, having laid down the position of a perfected creation, "as it is best if we are to understand the nature of plants or of men, to consider how they may proceed from seeds, rather than how they were created by God in the beginning of the world, if we can think out some extremely simple principles from which we can prove how the stars and the visible world could have originated—we shall in that way explain their nature better than by describing them as they now exist." The words we omitted from the passage say we know that the things spoken of "were created by God in the beginning of the world." We omitted them as a deflection from the current of the thought, we refer to them to emphasize our opinion of the writer's good faith.

The doubt has been somewhere described as "an hyperbolical" one. This we think a true description, so far as it means a method of calling attention to a fact not the less real that it was usually lost sight of when estimating our mental possessions. It may be regarded also as a method of abstraction by which the items of human knowledge are withdrawn from accidental associations at the time of acquisition or accretions of a later date.

It is true, in the history of the process by which he reached the conclusion that all his previous knowledge should be sifted, he questions the truthfulness of every source of information. It has been objected and forcibly that on such a basis certitude could never rise. Still the question remains, was the impeachment of the faculties genuine? If every source of knowledge is untrustworthy there can be no truth for us. To turn aside for a moment from the initial doubt, let us bear in mind that he asserts the validity of mathematical demonstrations. These rest on certain definitions, but they also rest on certain intuitions called axioms. It may be pointed out that he also doubts the validity of these demonstrations, that the intellect itself under the spell of his daemon has given unveracious testimony

as to the steps in the most simple processes of mathematical reasoning. But this must be taken according to his own version, that as long as he is looking at the process of demonstration he is convinced, he cannot choose but be convinced; it is only when he looks away and remembers, that doubts of the validity of the processes are possible. This proves nothing except, indeed, the hyperbole. Accordingly we have intellectual intuitions that are veracious and processes of inference that are irresistible.

We may now take a comparison. Allowing for what St. Thomas calls the prejudice of mathematicians against the value of the results in any department except their own, yet we have a measure in the contrast Des Cartes raises between the certitude of mathematics and the steps in the moral sciences. In the latter he says we can only attain probability. But that is what everybody says so far as the latter are not confirmed by the sanction of supernatural authority. Yet he makes a curious remark. He says that reason may attain certainty with regard to moral questions when the advancement by investigation in other fields of labor shall have supplied the material. Surely this does not argue a final distrust in the faculties; though it lies open to the objection that it gives reason a power she does not possess; namely, that of drawing conclusions of certitude in a domain in which only probability can be reached.

The doubt he has constituted is a principle of safeguarding. He relies on mathematical deductions, that is, on the faculties that present them. Suppose we transfer to this connection the intuition, *cogito ergo sum*, and analyze it this way. He is conscious of valid operations in mathematics and the certainty of the intuitions from which they primarily proceed. He is the person engaged in these processes, they are his activities, if they are valid he cannot be deceived as to his consciousness of them and of their validity. If he doubts as to their validity he cannot doubt of their existence, but their existence is inseparable from their validity, that is, inseparable from the consciousness of his own existence. As there is an imperfection in this existence, as its power is limited, he is conscious of the limitation, and in this consciousness of the finite he has the intuition of the infinite, that is, of perfection, that is, of God.

The objection then arises: He does not get beyond the mind; How is he to get beyond the mind? How bridge the chasm to the external world? The difficulty lies, we think, not in the so called scepticism of his factitious impeachment of the faculties but in a system which seems more like modern idealism than the direct and immediate knowledge we possess of external nature from the perceptions of sense. How far this proceeds from his metaphysic of the soul is not obvious: for if the soul sees the ideas and makes them

the material of thought it does not seem that the location of the soul in the pineal gland makes any difference as long as it presides over the physical organism as the principle of consciousness and vitality. Mr. Mivart represents him as making it distinct from the life of the body, as simply a spirit the activity of which is thought, as something separate from its case. Though we do not think Dr. Mivart has taken in Des Cartes' view of the relation between the soul and body, there seems no doubt that Des Cartes has not grapsed the scholastic idea that the soul is the informing spirit of the body. We wonder at this: for to this conclusion in a remarkable degree the latest physiological research is tending; and Des Cartes' own investigation of nervous activities is admittedly as far to the front as the most recent.[5] We do not think he at all meant that the soul in the pineal gland sits at the end of a telegraphic apparatus possessing the magic power of setting up the pictures of things abroad. In truth the soul was the animating principle in every part of the body: but what he seems to have wanted was the idea of man as a composite nature. We fear then that the want of this conception must at least unconsciously have made the physical organism stand in his speculation in the place of a medium between the ego which was the soul and external nature. Yet he arrived at the knowledge of external reality, but by a process which has been described in a consensus of disparagement from all quarters as arguing in a circle.[6]

It has been said that his argument for the existence of external reality depends for its validity on the existence of God and this for its validity depends on the veracity of his faculities. These were created by God whom he knows to be infinitely beneficent and just, and who would not curse his creature with the snare of mendacious faculties. He is placed in the midst of a universe by God in which his destiny is to be worked out by the powers conferred by the Creator. He is not a thing apart, there is nothing of the kind in creation, there is a link of dependence between him and the world round him as there is between him and the society of which he is a member. His life here and his life beyond the grave, both depend upon the use he makes of society and the world. A knowledge of both is essential to him, the idea he could be created by a perfect being to walk blindfold through life is in conflict with the laws of thought, though a being less than omnipotent could very well be conceived as sending him forth into the creation so marred and maimed and blasted by that power's malignity as to be unable to attain truth in speculative judgment, to distinguish right from wrong,

[5] Huxley.

[6] What is said, in effect, is that he argues in a circle to get beyond his own consciousness.

good from evil in practical judgment. He would be a wandering star the light of which was extinguished, to pass away perhaps from this scene into the universal energy which never can be increased perhaps, never diminished perhaps.

There must be then some means given him of using life, of employing powers that he is conscious of, powers that compel attention to their activities in every waking moment. He has received this means by the power of discerning "clear ideas." Whenever he has a clear idea, that is the possession of truth, for it is the knowledge of the thing itself, truth is the property of a clear idea. The faculties vouched for by God so present it. He has a clear idea of God himself, that is a true idea, he could not have that idea so clear and luminous and overpowering unless it stood for a real existence—in other words—that it was a true idea. The faculties with which God has endowed him tell him this is true, coerce him to recognize this to be true, convince him of this: but as God could not have endowed him with lying faculties, therefore, God exists. This is how critics present him.

How the misconception in all this criticism arose it is hard to understand. As we have said it is not confined to any school; all critics from all parts of the compass join in it. We hope we shall not fall under the sentence of one critic who has, in a most able manual of elementary philosophy, characterized Des Cartes as a man who has developed a colossal conceit.[7] The usual course of criticism is to separate the condition of veracity for the presentation of the senses, from the philosophy of clear ideas in relation to God. To treat the latter as a conception valid from the clearness of the idea that validity being guaranteed by God.

But the idea of God, as we have already pointed out, is an intuition of the infinite from the finite, the perfect from the imperfect. It is an intuition transcending relation and opposition. Des Cartes even goes the length of saying it is prior to the idea of self-consciousness. This we think inconsistent with his history of it, but still we could say there might be a logical precedence, if not a priority, in time. To the objection that the idea of God must be negative, that of self existence being the positive, he answers that it is the other way. The infinite is the positive, it is where limits are concerned that negation begins, for the infinite contains all within itself, the perfect all within itself: whilst the drawing of boundaries is the negation of the infinite. This might lead to the annihilation of created existences, the transforming them into modes or manifestations of the uncreated but it moves along a different line from the theory of clear ideas; and it is simply a confusion of thought which causes his

[7] Mill said this of Comte.

critics to describe his conception of God as one derived by the fallacy of arguing in a circle.

Whatever may be said of this purely intellectual realization, the idea of a perfect Creator is one which none of his pretended followers in the eighteenth century have risen to. Voltaire, while inferring from the design evident everywhere, a power that designed, writes such shocking blasphemies about the Lord that we cannot suppose him capable of thinking of a God possessing moral qualities. We could not give these blasphemies to the reader, they are too diabolical even for an age of free-thinking, when the age has a regard for dignity of thought and language. We have this conception of Voltaire's resuscitated by Robespierre in a practical fantasy of sacerdotal imitation, that is to say Robespierre, in swallow-tail blue coat, plays the part of high-priest of Voltaire's Supreme Being and sets fire to a card-board effigy of atheism, amid the cheers of his sans culottes. Yet he is said to have displayed the truest grasp of the political situation of any man of the time, not excepting Mirabeau. We have only to say that Mirabeau, incarnate obloquy though he was, possessed the genius of a statesman. He alone in those days of judicial blindness saw that if the state were to stand it should be on the basis of reconciliation with the past, with the memories, traditions, institutions, customs, laws that had been interwoven with the national mind. He believed it possible that forces of reform could be infused into the social system, that a monarchy, broad-based on the peoples' will would enter on a new existence as the guarantee for equal justice and the security for public order. Unfortunate in his atheism and the profligacy of his life, religion and morality could not be served by such unholy and unclean hands. He said in his last breath he bore the monarchy with him: no, it was his sins that had found him and made the great gifts with which he had been endowed a sign, a wonder for their impotence. The reign of anarchy had set in.

It is not intended in this article to ask a place in any curriculum for the philosophy of Des Cartes. Our only object was to point out that a name once great in all the fields of science has been allowed to fall into discredit where he might claim a home. If it be true that a history of modern thought cannot be written without his name being set down as the marking of an epoch it would follow that no system of education can be considered complete which does not recognize the part he took in the development of philosophy. The most recent thinkers of all shades are spoken of in our schools. There is not one who does not admit indebtedness to him in natural science and mathematics. In metaphysics and natural theology men have been led by him towards the safe way in-so-far as these pur-

suits have conducted them to an appreciation of God as personal and of infinite perfection.

We have endeavored to show that he is in no way responsible for the theories advanced in France during the century in which the Revolution began. His idea was to combine in a system the worlds of intellect and external nature as the work of the same creative mind. To find the indecomposable point in the world of intellect, and the indecomposable point in that of matter was the task he set himself with an energy like a Titan's piling mountain upon mountain to the skies. The strength and the simplicity of the conception will always have an interest for the genuine student. Among the ironies in which fate has been fruitful the most singular is the selection of him by the Constituent Assembly as its genius.

To estimate it properly one must summon spirits from "the vasty deep." The ghosts of Danton, Marat, Robespierre, walk before us, their hands dripping with blood. The Girondists emerge from the shadows with the marks of justice on themselves who had done unworthy slaughter upon others. We see the blameless King, we see the Queen in that time of omens, clear of intellect, with faith fixed as the everlasting hills and see both borne to their doom. Amid the blood and horror the great philosopher is called, but not by us, as the spirit that inspired them.

George McDermot, C. S. P.

New York.

THE TWO STABATS.

(II. THE DOLOROSA.)

IN the January issue of the *Review* a comparison was instituted between the Speciosa and the Dolorosa, and some prefatory observations were made on the general character of both hymns. The Speciosa was also considered in detail. In the present paper, therefore, exclusive attention may be given to the incomparably grander hymn, the Dolorosa.

I. AUTHORSHIP.

The hymn has been ascribed to many different possible authors: (a) Innocent III. (✻1216), an ascription which Gregorovius declares unfounded. Benedict XIV., in his *De Festis D. N. J. C. et B. V. M.*, gives it without question to Innocent III.: "Auctor fuit magnae doctrinae clarus praestantia Summus Pontifex Innocentius III.", and quotes three authorities. Mone, in his notes on the hymn, and Hurter, in his Life of the Pope, give it to the same great Pontiff. The latest writer on the subject, the Rev. J. Mearns, after reviewing the claims of other candidates, ascribes it to Innocent with a (?) and says: "Certainly, Pope Innocent III. had quite sufficient ability to have written such a masterpiece, and the ascription is strengthened by the fact that to him has been attributed, with great probability, another masterpiece of Latin sacred poetry, viz., the *Veni sancte Spiritus Et emitte.*" Before this, the Rev. Mr. Duffield had written with much positiveness: "He did not write the *Stabat Mater*, nor did he compose the *Veni sancte.*" Following the thought of Mone that the original text comprised in all probability stanzas 1, 4, 3, 5, 9, 10 of the Roman Missal text, Wackernagel prints this cento and ascribes it to Innocent. The cento is reprinted by Kayser, but merely as a convenience for the reader, since there is no manuscript authority for it:

1. Stabat mater dolorosa
   Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
   Dum pendebat filius:
   Cujus animam gementem,
   Contristantem et dolentem,
   Pertransivit gladius.

5. Eia mater, fons amoris,
   Me sentire vim doloris
   Fac, ut tecum lugeam;
   Fac ut ardeat cor meum
   In amando Christum Deum
   Ut sibi complaceam.

4. Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Jesum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Moriendo desolatum,
Dum emisit spiritum.

3. Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Christi matrem si videret
In tanto supplicio?
Quis non posset contristari
Piam matrem contemplari
Dolentem cum filio.

9. Fac me plagis vulnerari
Cruceque me fac beari
Ob amorem filii;
Inflammatus et accensus
Per te, pia, sim defensus
In die iudicii.

10. Christe, cum sit hinc transire,
Da per matrem me venire
Ad palmam victoriae;
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut anima donetur
Paradisi gloriae.

(b) Jacobus de Benedictis (Giacomo da Todi, known also as Giacopone or Jacopone), the Latinized form of Giacomo de' Benedetti, a Franciscan (*1306). This is the most common ascription, and, at first review of the evidence in its favor, the most probable one. A careful analysis of the evidence, however, is not reassuring. An Italian manuscript of the fifteenth century, entitled: "Incipiunt laudes quas fecit sanctus frater Jacobus de Tuderto, ordinis fratrum minorum," has, in addition to the Italian *Laude*, seven Latin hymns, viz.:

I. Jesu dulcis memoria,
II. Verbum caro factum est,
III. Crux de te volo conqueri,
IV. Cur mundus militat,
V. Ave regis angelorum,
VI. Stabat mater speciosa,
VII. Stabat mater dolorosa.

Nos. 6 and 7 have the authority of this MS. But a glance at the other entries will lessen the force of this inclusion. No. 1 antedates Jacopone, and is most probably St. Bernard's composition. No. 2 belongs to the twelfth century. No. 4 is very doubtful. An edition of the *Laude* published at Florence in 1490 contains no Latin poems, and in the full edition of his poems edited by the Franciscan Tressati (Venice, 1617) the *Stabat mater dolorosa* does not appear. An argument favorable to the ascription has been based on such expressions in the hymn as:

Sancta mater, istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati vulnerati
Tam dignati pro me pati
Poenas mecum divide,

and

Fac ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem
Et plagas recolere,

and

Fac me plagis vulnerari,

which have been considered as probable references to the wonderful conferring of the Stigmata upon St. Francis. And from this it has been thought a likely supposition that the author of the hymn must have been a Franciscan. This, of course, would not be an identification of the Franciscan with Jacopone; and, as has been pointed out, the Vulgate furnishes texts used in the Breviary (such as: Quid sunt plagae istae in medio manuum tuarum? Et dicet: His plagatus sum in domo eorum qui diligebant me; as also St. Paul's words: Ego enim stigmata Domini Jesu in corpore mea porto) which might have suggested the phrases quoted from the hymn.

(c) St. Gregory the Great (*604). The verse form is not, however, older that the middle of the twelfth century.

(d) St. Bernard (*1153); St. Bonaventure (*1274); Gregory XI. (*1378). Speaking of the Flagellants, in whose processions the *Stabat* was sometimes sung, Antonius (called, because of his short stature, Antoninus), the Florentine historian and moralist (*1450), says that the author of the hymn was thought to be a certain Gregory. From the manner of the reference, this Gregory must have been some well-known personage, possibly Gregory XI. (*1378): "Incredibilis devotionis ardore longa horum dealbatorum agmina ad varias urbes commeabant, processionaliter bini pergentes, pacem, misericordiam supplici clamore saepe clamantia ac laudes et hymnos in latina vel vulgari lingua decantantia, praecipue sequentiam illam quam dicunt Gregorium edidisse: '*Stabat mater dolorosa.*'"

None of the above ascriptions can be considered as better than conjectural; and we are compelled to leave the question unsolved, with the thought of Cardinal Wiseman as a comforting reflection: "The modesty, or to speak more Christianly, the humility of the authors led them to conceal in every way their names; so that while every one admires those sweet and often sublime conceptions, such as are also *Dies irae, Stabat mater*, etc., hardly one can be attributed to its author with any degree of certainty. The causes of obscurity are shown to attest the spirit of this age in the close communion and charitable bond without envy and jealousy of different churches and in the humility and true modesty of its saints and sages." (Lectures on Holy Week, p. 122.)

In the following translation from the text of the Roman Missal and Breviary, we have tried to preserve the multiple rhyme observable in the second and sixth stanzas of the Latin.

TEXT OF THE ROMAN MISSAL.

Stabat mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
  Dum pendebat filius.
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristatam et dolentem,
  Pertransivit gladius.

O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
  Mater unigeniti!
Quae moerebat et dolebat,
Pia mater, dum videbat
  Nati poenas inclyti.

Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Matrem Christi si videret
  In tanto supplicio?
Quis non posset contristari
Christi matrem contemplari
  Dolentem cum filio?

Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Jesum in tormentis
  Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Moriendo desolatum,
  Dum emisit spiritum.

Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim doloris
  Fac, ut tecum lugeam;
Fac, ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum,
  Ut sibi complaceam.

TRANSLATION.

O the sadness and affliction
Of the Mother's dereliction
  At the Cross of her dear Son!
Through her heart, His woe perceiving,
Broken with excess of grieving,
  Passed the Sword of Simeon.

Such a sadness hath no other
Bosom felt, as that blest Mother
  Of the Sole-begotten One:
O the swelling grief upwelling,
In that virgin-bosom dwelling,
  As she gazed her God upon!

Who could tearless view that loving
Mother, every moment proving
  Depths of woe beyond belief?
Who could see, nor share her sorrows,
As at every glance she borrows
  From His pains a newer grief?

For His people's sins atoning,
Saw she Jesus bleeding, groaning,
  Given up to scourge and rod:
Him Who love alone should waken,
Saw she desolate, forsaken,
  Crying yield His soul to God.

Mother, fount of love o'erflowing,
Let me feel thy sorrow, knowing
  None such other deep delight:
Let me burn with the sweet fever
Of Christ's love, that I forever
  May be pleasing in His sight.

Sancta mater, istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
  Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati vulnerati,
Tam dignati pro me pati,
  Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me tecum pie flere,
Crucifixo condolere,
  Donec ego vixero;
Juxta crucem tecum stare,
Et me tibi sociare
  In planctu desidero.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara,
  Fac me tecum plangere;
Fac, ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem
  Et plagas recolere.

Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Fac me cruce inebriari
  Et cruore filii.
Flammis ne urar succensus;
Per te, virgo, sim defensus
  In die judicii.

Christe, cum sit hinc exire,
Da per matrem me venire
  Ad palmam victoriae:
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac, ut animae donetur
  Paradisi gloria.
Amen.

Mother, let my heart be wounded
With His wounds, and the unbounded
  Sorrows of the Crucified:
Who, from bending Heaven descending,
Came amending earth's offending—
  All His pains with me divide.

Let me stand beside thee weeping,
Ever near to Jesus keeping
  Until death mine eyes shall close:
At the Cross of dereliction
I shall share in thy affliction,
  See thy tears and feel thy woes.

Virgin, virgins all excelling,
Pity me, and let my swelling
  Heart pour forth its flood of tears:
I would share His death, and wear His
Wounds within my heart, and bear His
  Dying throes and human fears!

Wound for wound my spirit keeping,
All its senses wholly steeping
  In the wine-red cup outpoured—
Let no breath of hell assail me;
Dearest Mother, do not fail me
  At the great Day of the Lord.

Saviour, when the veil is riven,
May thy Mother, throned in Heaven,
  Grant the everlasting prize:
When my soul hath cast its burden—
Dust to dust—O grant the guerdon
  Won by Thee in Paradise!
Amen.

II. LITURGICAL USE.

It is beyond question that the hymn was well known to all classes of men towards the end of the fourteenth century. The Flagellants had popularized it in their processions too widely and too thoroughly to admit of any doubt in this matter. Did the Church borrow the hymn from these condemned heretics? "Non accepit ecclesia carmen ab haereticis, sed haeretici ex ecclesia prosam depraedati sunt," as Daniel so well remarks in his Thesaurus (II., p. 140). No ascription of the hymn has been conjectured save to some churchman, as the names given in the preceding section will sufficiently indicate. And if the ascription to Jacopone be the correct one, it is very likely that from the Franciscan houses the prosa found its way gradually into other missals. The Roman Missal, indeed, introduced it only quite recently (after 1727), but gave it the unique honor amongst sequences of a place in the Breviary, where, divided into three hymns, it adorns the office of the Seven Dolors (the Friday after Passion Sunday).

III. CRITICAL ESTIMATES.

Protestant tributes to the beauty and power of the hymn are apt to be disfigured by wanton references to its "Mariolatry." A bright exception to this kind of criticism is the long and exquisite tribute of the great hymnologist, Daniel, who in his *Thesaurus* calls the *Stabat mater dolorosa* the "queen of sequences" (V., p. 59), and in another place in the same treasury (II., pp. 136-8) speaks at length of the splendid merits of the hymn. "When St. John," he says, "wished to depict for us the sorrowing Mary and her Son, with the loving accuracy and wonderful simplicity eminently characteristic of the evangelists, he contented himself with the single statement: Stabat juxta crucem mater eius. Few are the words, but weighty; for in the briefest compass they bring into the light all the longing, the sorrow, the sadness, hidden in Mary's heart. And since in all times many are to be found so bruised and broken by affliction that sorrow lies in their souls like a sword, it is not strange that, in the Roman Church, so many have gone, and still go, in supplication to this Mother of Sorrows, with such an ardor of piety. Witness the statues set up in churches and by the roadsides in honor of this sorrowful Mother; witness the lamps burning, day and night, before her images, the festivals set apart, the sodalities, the sermons, the hymns, the prayers and praises consecrated to her honor. But amongst all the hymns rehearsing the praises of the Mother of Sorrows, the one just given (i. e., the *Stabat mater dolorosa)* holds, by common consent, the first place *(omnium consensu palmare est)*. The

first words of the hymn recall briefly the historical narrative; then the poet, with words of honeyed sweetness, begins to paint, as with native colors, the sorrows of Mary. From this it is clear that our hymn, although perhaps similar in some respects to the *Dies irae*, belongs to an entirely different class; for while one of the hymns busies itself with a description of an event upon which, as it were, we ourselves are gazing, the other tries to express the intimate feelings of the soul; while one places before our eyes a certain scene, the other opens up the recesses of the heart. They have therefore this relation to each other, that they cannot be compared; and yet their musical rhythms and phrases have been so perfectly wrought, that not only have they—I shall not say no superior—but no equal amongst hymns."

Dr. Philip Schaff, in his *Literature and Poetry* (p. 191), says: "The secret of the power of the *Mater Dolorosa* lies in the intensity of feeling with which the poet identifies himself with his theme, and in the soft, plaintive melody of its Latin rhythm and rhyme, which cannot be transferred to any other language. It draws the reader irresistibly into sympathy with the agony described, and makes him a fellow-sufferer with Mary. It fills him with grief for his own sins which have cost such a sacrifice, and with gratitude for the love of the Son of God, who spared not His own life for our redemption." He then touches, with more mildness, however, than most Protestants, on the favorite objection to the ardent supplications contained in the hymn: "The only objectionable feature in this incomparable poem is a touch of what Protestants call Mariolatry, which excludes it from evangelical hymn books unless the prayer to Mary be changed into a prayer to Christ." He then rehearses the common objections, but is honest in his endeavor to place before his Protestant readers the distinctions familiar to every Catholic child—a piece of honesty sadly lacking, as a rule, in such hymnological comment as we are now illustrating. It is pleasant, therefore, to come across such a gentle treatment as Dr. Schaff begins to administer: "It is, after all, Christ's sufferings which were reflected in Mary's agony; as it is the heavenly beauty of the Christ-child which shines on the faces of the Madonnas of Raphael. We must give to Roman Catholics credit for their distinction between different kinds of worship; adoration *(latria)*, which belongs to God alone; veneration *(dulia)*, which is due to saints in the presence of God; and a special degree of veneration or semi-adoration [why would not "special degree of veneration" suffice? and what is *semi*-adoration?] which is claimed for the Virgin Mary, as the Mother of the Saviour and the Queen of Saints in heaven. They do not pray to Mary as the giver of the mercies desired, but only as the interceder, thinking that she

is more likely to prevail with her Son than any poor unaided sinner on earth."

In the Proem to his translation, Abraham Coles, M. D., Ph. D., does not hesitate, in lauding the hymn, to use the words "idolatrous" and "Romanist." "The devout Protestant," he remarks, "is necessarily offended in the *Stabat Mater* by a devotion he believes misdirected and idolatrous, in the adoration which it pays to the Virgin. . . . The most zealous Romanist will be constrained to admit that there has been no backwardness evinced on the part of those who are not of his faith to do ample justice to the lyric excellence of the *Stabat Mater*." He appends to the translation a section of "Remarks," in which he discusses more amply the "objectionable features" of the hymn, as though he felt that he had scarce done justice to the matter in his Proem: "No admiration of the lyric excellence of the *Stabat Mater* should be allowed to blind the reader to those objectionable features which must always suffice, as they have hitherto done, to exclude it from every hymnarium of Protestant Christendom. For not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her. Her agency is invoked as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal." And he continues, through three additional pages, to elaborate his wooden exegesis.

Lovely and pathetic as the *Stabat Mater* is, and in the common judgment of hymnologists, yielding first place in Latin hymnody only to the *Dies irae*, it is nevertheless excluded by Trench* from his ample collection of mediæval hymns. Stern and uncompromising as such a course must appear, it surely seems more reasonable than to spend minute and laborious care upon a rendering of the hymn, and then to usher the translation into public notice with a series of prolegomena and annotations which declare, in many varieties of phrase but with a unique burden of meaning, that the grand hymn is simple idolatry.

IV. TRANSLATIONS.

The *Dolorosa* has been very frequently translated into modern vernacular tongues. In German, Lisco (1843) enumerated 78 versions; and in Dutch, 4 versions. In English, there are probably 40 translations. As in the case of the *Dies irae*, the subtle music of the double rhymes, the melodiousness of the Latin sounds, the compressed character of the Latin syntax, combine to make the hymn well-nigh untranslatable. But the difficulty of the task has appar-

*Saintsbury (*The Flourishing of Romance*, p. 77, footnote) considers French's exclusion of the hymn "a little touch of orthodox prudery."

ently only served to whet the zeal of the translators, and some very good renderings remain to attest the skill and patience of the workmen. Dr. Coles confesses to an earnest desire to do his very best: "In attempting to add another to those already existing, the present translator has been moved by a desire to produce one more literal, if possible, than any he has seen. He is not, he confesses, friendly to free translations. Free, he has observed, is another name for false. A counterfeit is put in place of the genuine; so that instead of a *Stabat* we get only some worthless substitute. He honors that painstaking religious scrupulosity which respects the sacredness of words as well as thoughts; and shuns all sacrilegious license and profane handling—carrying this reverence for the venerated text so far as to be unwilling, if it can possibly be helped, to vary one jot or tittle, either in the way of substitution or alteration."

It should prove interesting to study the attempt of a fine poet like Aubrey de Vere to render the immortal hymn into English verse:

STABAT MATER DOLOROSA.

By the cross of expiation
The Mother stood, and kept her station,
  Weeping for her Son and Lord:
With the nails his hands were riven;
Through her heart the sword was driven,
  Simeon's dread, predicted sword.

Oh, that blessed one grief-laden,
Blessed Mother, blessed Maiden,
  Mother of the All-holy One;
Oh, that silent, ceaseless mourning,
Oh, those dim eyes never turning
  From that wondrous, suffering Son.

Who is he of nature human
Tearless that could watch that Woman?
  Hear unmoved that Mother's moan?
Who, unchanged in shape and colour,
Who could mark that Mother's dolour,
  Weeping with her Son alone?

For his people's sins the All-holy
There she saw, a victim lowly,
  Bleed in torments, bleed and die:
Saw the Lord's Anointed taken;
Saw her Child in death forsaken;
  Heard his last expiring cry.

Fount of love and sacred sorrow,
Mother, may my spirit borrow
  Sadness from thy holy woe;
May it love—on fire within me—
Christ, my God, till great love win me
  Grace to please him here below.

Those five wounds of Jesus smitten,
Mother, in my heart be written
  Deeply as in thine they be;
Thou my Saviour's cross who bearest,
Thou thy Son's rebuke who sharest,
  Let me share them both with thee.

In the passion of my Maker
Be my sinful soul partaker;
  Let me weep till death with thee:
Unto me this boon be given,
By thy side, like thee bereaven,
  To stand beneath the atoning tree.

Virgin holiest, Virgin purest,
Of that anguish thou endurest
  Make me bear with thee my part;
Of his passion bear the token
In a spirit bowed and broken,
  Bear his death within my heart.

May his wounds both wound and heal me;
His blood enkindle, cleanse, anneal me;
  Be his cross my hope and stay:
Virgin, when the mountains quiver,
From that flame which burns forever,
  Shield me on the judgment day.

Christ, when he that shaped me calls me,
When advancing death appals me,
  Through her prayer the storm make calm:
When to dust my dust returneth
Save a soul to thee that yearneth;
  Grant it thou the crown and palm.

A. de Vere.

General Dix, who had translated the *Dies irae* at Fortress Monroe during the Civil War, afterwards essayed the *Stabat Mater* under very different circumstances. The field of battle was not so un-

favorable a place for translating the "Great Hymn" as was the "Parisian saloon" in which the Minister Plenipotentiary achieved his version of the *Stabat:* "As I proceeded, I could not but think under how much more favorable circumstances than mine Jacobus de Benedictus must have written the immortal hymn. He was in all probability sitting in his narrow cell, the external world entirely shut out, with nothing before him but a crucifix, to which it was only necessary to lift his eyes when he felt the spirit of inspiration flagging. On the other hand, I was compelled to write in a Parisian saloon, amid the glare of meretricious gilding, almost under the shadow of the great triumphal arch—one of those gigantic memorials of human victories which for the cause of human civilization had much better be forgotten than commemorated; the canvas on the walls swarming with young fauns, cupids, and other Pagan devices. In making the translation I kept in view three or four leading objects which I will briefly state:

"I. An inflexible adherence to the rhythm.

"II. A faithful preservation of every thought contained in the original.

"III. A vigorous exclusion of every thought not contained in it.

"IV. A preservation, as far as possible, of the tenderness of feeling and expression, which is the characteristic of the hymn."

A partial view of the difficulties encountered in translating such a hymn may be obtained by comparing various renderings of the first stanza:

Stabat mater dolorosa,
Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
  Dum pendebat filius;
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristatam et dolentem,
  Pertransivit gladius.

Caswall's version carries out the original rhythm only in the first stanza; in the remaining ones, he falls into the much easier single-syllabled rhyme:

At the Cross her station keeping,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
  Close to Jesus to the last:
Through her heart, his sorrow sharing,
All his bitter anguish bearing,
  Now at length the sword had passed.

Lord Lindsay sticks to the rhymes "keeping, weeping," but forthwith sinks into the single rhyme:

By the Cross, sad vigil keeping,
Stood the mournful mother weeping,
While on it the Saviour hung:
In that hour of deep distress,
Pierced the sword of bitterness
Through her heart with sorrow wrung.

Dr. Coles cannot avoid the "Weeping, keeping:"

Stood the afflicted mother weeping,
Near the cross her station keeping
Whereon hung her Son and Lord;
Through whose spirit sympathizing,
Sorrowing and agonizing,
Also passed the cruel sword.

The Rev. J. S. B. Monsell (who, in his endeavor to avoid the "objectionable features" of the hymn, changes the address to the Mother of Sorrows into addresses to Christ and the Father, thus rendering the hymn "evangelical"), is similarly wedded to the old recurring rhymes "weeping, keeping:"

Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
By the cross her vigil keeping,
While her Jesus hung thereon:
Through her heart, in sorrow moaning,
With Him grieving, for Him groaning,
Through that heart the sword hath gone.

So, too, the Rev. Dr. Johnson:

Stood the mournful mother weeping,
Near the cross her vigil keeping,
Where He hung, her Son adored.
Through her soul, of hope forsaken,
And of mighty sorrows shaken,
Pierced the sharp relentless sword.

So, too, the Hon. J. L. Hayes:

Stood the grief-struck Mother weeping,
At the Cross her vigil keeping,
Where her suffering Son was bound;
And her heart with anguish groaning
And his agony bemoaning,
Bleeds with every bleeding wound.

So, too, the Rev. W. S. Mackenzie, D. D.:

Stood the Virgin-mother weeping
Near the cross, sad vigils keeping
O'er her Son there crucified:
Through her soul in sorrow moaning,
Racked with grief, with anguish groaning,
Pierced the sword as prophesied.

So, too, D. F. McCarthy's fine version:

By the cross, on which suspended,
With his bleeding hands extended,
Hung that Son she so adored,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
She whose heart, its silence keeping,
Grief had cleft as with a sword.

In the third stanza the same rhymes are given:

What man is there so unfeeling,
Who, his heart to pity steeling,
Could behold that sight unmoved?
Could Christ's Mother see there weeping,
See the pious Mother keeping
Vigil by the Son she loved?

"Anonymous" repeats the rhymes:

There she stood, the mother weeping!
Nigh the Cross sad watches keeping,
While her Son did hang and bleed!
Bitter were her tears and grieving:
Through that bosom, wildly heaving,
There had passed a sword indeed!

"A Protestant Transfusion" by Rev. Henry Mills:

Near the cross was Mary weeping,
There her mournful station keeping,
Gazing on her dying Son:
There in speechless anguish groaning,
Yearning, trembling, sighing, moaning—
Through her soul the sword had gone.

"Anonymous" (from Schaff's *Christ in Song*):

At the cross her station keeping,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
Where He hung, her Son and Lord.
For her soul, of joy bereavèd,
Bowed with anguish, deeply grievèd,
Felt the sharp and piercing sword.

The Catholic translations of the hymn have been thoughtful and accurate. Mr. Orby Shipley has gathered some of these into his *Annus Sanctus*, and they are accessible therefore to the interested student. In the *Catholic World* (April, 1870) a very good version, presumably by a Catholic, appeared as a reprint from the *Democratic Magazine* of thirty years previous, together with a version into Greek by Otto George Mayer. The English translation begins:

Broken-hearted, lo, and tearful,
Bowed before that Cross so fearful,
Stands the Mother by the Son!
Through her bosom sympathizing
In his mortal agonizing
Deep and keen the steel has gone.

Powerful as is the version of Aubrey de Vere, it nevertheless contains occasional (and apparently unnecessary) crudenesses in metre. It would be doubtless interesting to compare further the various attempts to master the great difficulties offered by the monumental hymn even to the most painstaking translator, were not the present paper already over-bulky; and accordingly we must pass on to the question of variant texts without further delay.

VARIANT TEXTS.

In the following text of Georgius Stella (who attributes the hymn to John XXII.), chancellor of Genoa (✻c. 1420) stanzas additional to those in the Roman Missal will be indicated by brackets; the minor verbal or phrasal variations need scarcely be noted.

1. Stabat mater dolorosa
Iuxta crucem lacrimosa,
Dum pendebat filius;
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristantem et dolentem
Pertransivit gladius.

2. O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
Mater unigeniti!
Quae moerebat et dolebat
Et tremebat, dum videbat
Nati poenas inclyti.

3. Quis non potest contristari,
Matrem Christi contemplari
Dolentem cum filio?
[In me sistat dolor tui,
Crucifixo fac me frui,
Dum sum in exilio.

4. Hunc dolorem fac me moestum,
Nec me facias alienum
Ab hoc desiderio.
Illum corde, illum ore
Semper feram cum dolore
Et mentis martyrio.]

5. Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Matrem Christi si videret
In tanto supplicio?
[Quis tam fortis degustaret
Poenas matris, cum clamaret
In tanto iudicio?]

6. Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Christum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Morientem desolatum,
Cum emisit spiritum.

7. Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim doloris
Fac, ut tecum lugeam:
Fac, ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum deum
Et sibi complaceam.

8. Sancta mater istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati vulnerati,
Tam dignati pro me pati,
Poenas mecum divide.

9. [Alma salus, advocata,
Morte Christi desolata,
Miserere populi;
Virgo dulcis, virgo pia,
Virgo clemens, o Maria,
Audi preces servuli.]

10. Fac me vere tecum flere,
Crucifixo condolere,
Donec ego vixero;
Iuxta crucem tecum stare,
Te libenter sociare
Cum planctu desidero.

11. Virgo virginum praeclara
Iam non mihi sis amara,
Fac me tecum plangere;
Fac, ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis eius sortem
Et plagas recolere.

12. Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Cruce fac inebriari
Et cruore filii.
Inflammatus et accensus
Per te, virgo, sim defensus
In die iudicii.

13. [Fac me cruce custodiri,
Morte Christi praemuniri
Confoveri gratia.]
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac, ut animae donetur
Paradisi gloria.

Another elaboration of the text is found in a work of the Franciscan Bernardinus de Bustis (*1500). The additional stanzas are given here:

11. Virgo dulcis, o Maria,
Tu plorabas voce pia
Coram cruce filium.
Rumpebatur cor Mariae
Deplorantis valde pie:
"O fili dulcissime!

12. "Cum te cerno morientem,
Ego perdo cor et mentem
Et tota deficio.
O columba sine felle,
Vas (que) dulci plenum melle,
O fili piissime!

13. "Tu me vides desolatam,
Semivivam, anxiatam,
Et mihi non loqueris.
O Gabriel, illud ave
Dulce nimis et suave
Nunc dat mihi gemitum.

14. "Nunc vertuntur in moerorem
Et in luctum et dolorem
Nunciata gaudia;
Mihi namque est ablatus
Et in cruce conclavatus
Qui me replet gratia.

15. "O crux alta, de te queror,
Mihi nequis esse peior,
O crux crudelissima!
Meum natum tu cepisti,
Ipsum in te suspendisti,
O crux ferocissima!

16. "Ergo saltem nunc te placa,
Quam exoro voce rauca:
Reddas mihi filium.
Et si non vis te placare
Neque natum mihi dare,
Tu me secum recipe."

17. Nam consolor, si me capis,
Si me spernis, tu me tradis
Mortali supplicio.

V. MUSICAL SETTINGS.

The Stabat Mater, combining as it does epic narration, lyric emotion, and throughout a vivid word-painting, offers much variety in suggestion and in interpretation to the musical creator and artist. In Plain Chant alone there are four musical settings, not to speak of the variations arising from local usage. Of these, the one in the First Mode in the Ratisbon *Graduale* is part of the official chant as recommended several times by Popes Pius IX. and Leo XIII. Its simple melody, sung without harmonization of voice or instruments, is overpowering. A much simpler melody (harmonized, however) is usually sung in churches in this country, as it is suitable for use by a large congregation as well as by a small choir. The Benedictines of Solesmes, in their *Paroissien Romain* give (p. 801) a pleasing variation of this very simple chant, and repeat it in another place in the same volume (p. 1229).

Josquin des Pres, the great Netherlands master, "the idol of Europe" (as Baini styles him), wrote in the fifteenth century a musical setting of the *Stabat* of which Mr. Rockstro declares that "so elaborate is this work, that not one of the most highly developed of the Composer's Masses surpasses it." He was followed by Palestrina in the same task; and, great as had been his success, was distanced wholly by the immortalizing twain of settings composed by Palestrina. Of Pergolesi's *Stabat* we have the interesting comment of the German poet Tieck: "The loveliness of sorrow in the depth of pain, the smiling in tears, the childlike simplicity, which touches on the highest heaven, had to me never before risen so bright in the soul. I had to turn away to hide my tears, especially at the place,

'Vidit suum dulcem natum.'"

Haydn's *Stabat* "is a treasury of refined and graceful Melody." Some less familiar names in the long list are: Steffani, Clari, Astorga, Winter, Raimondi, Vito, Lanza, Inzenga, the Chevalier

Neukomm. Of Rossini's *Stabat* it is unnecessary to speak at great length. It is confessed on all sides to be a wonderful composition, but has not escaped criticism as very inappropriate to the text. But even in this matter it has had some gentle defenders. Rockstro, for instance, remarks: "We do not pause to inquire whether the sensuous beauty of Rossini's *Stabat Mater* is worthy of the subject, or not; but we do say, of critics who judge it harshly, and dilettanti who can listen to it unmoved that they must either be casehardened by pedantry, or destitute of all 'ear for Music.' Rossini had already produced his *William Tell* before he essayed the *Stabat*. Father Taunton defends the *Stabat* in words worth quoting: "To judge it properly one should remember, as in the case of Haydn, that religion to a Catholic is something more personal and intimate than it can be to any one else. Again, to an Italian there is no such thing as the mysterious gloom of religion. He lives in the full sunlight of Catholicism, and the supernatural is part and parcel of his daily life, and to no one is he more tender in his love, childlike and simple as it is, than he is to Our Lady. This, then, is the key to the understanding of Italian Church Music, and to the work in point —the *Stabat Mater*. An Englishman possibly would not have written a *Stabat* like Rossini's—most likely could not—but that is no reason to decry a composition because we are not accustomed to view it from the same point of view as the composer did. . . . As to the *Stabat Mater*, who can doubt the religious sentiment of the opening chorus, or the marvelous expression of which the *Cujus animam* (too often misinterpreted) is capable, the tenderness and pathos of the *Pro peccatis*, and the grandeur of the *Inflammatus?* These, and the unaccompanied quartette *Quando corpus*, will ever hold their place among the best works of modern Church Music" (*History and Growth of Church Music*, pp. 78-9).

The long list may well close with a reference to Dvórâk, who, as Mr. Rockstro says, "in still more modern, and very different musical phraseology," illustrated the perennial freshness and inspiration of the *Stabat Mater*.

H. T. Henry.

Overbrook Seminary.

AN IRISH HISTORIAN OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

EVERY student of Irish antiquities will welcome this first instalment of a new edition and translation of Keating's *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* or "Origins of Irish History," due to the pen of a well-known scholar, Mr. David Comyn.[1] The priest, Geoffrey Keating (?1570-1650), was a writer of the old school, an Irish Herodotus, as Dr. Hyde truly puts it, who invented nothing and embroidered little, but who wrote in the current Irish vernacular of the seventeenth century what he found in the old vellums of the monasteries and the brehons. It has been said that Herodotus caught the smile on the face of Greece. On the war-worn face of seventeenth-century Ireland there was no smile to catch—on its lips, however, trembled yet the thoughts and the ideals of a golden age, a faery "Juventus mundi." In matters of fact, less accurate than his contemporaries, the Four Masters, his work is nevertheless independent, drawn from the same class of sources and often from the same "Illuminated Hosts of the Books of Erin." The Four Masters wrote their incomparable annals in an archaic bardic dialect, the property even then of a coterie of antiquarian scribes and teachers, while Keating's diction is that of the best Irish society of his own day, "veritably Irish uncontaminated by English phrases," says Dr. Atkinson, "and written by a master of the language while it was yet a power." But for the unhappy circumstances of his country, thinks Mr. Comyn, he might have been the founder of a modern native historical school in the Irish language.[2] His contemporaries,

[1] "The History of Ireland," by Geoffrey Keating, D. D., Vol. I., containing the Introduction and the First Book of the History, edited with translation and notes by David Comyn, M. R. I. A., London. Printed for the Irish Texts Society by David Nutt, 57-59, Long Acre, 1900. 8vo. pp. 237.

[2] During the first half of the seventeenth century the Irish, heavily handicapped as they were and deprived of the power of printing, nevertheless made tremendous efforts to keep abreast of the rest of Europe in science and literature. It was, indeed, an age of national scholarship which has never since been equaled. It was this half century that produced in rapid succession Geoffrey Keating, the Four Masters, and Duald MacFirbis, men of whom any age or country might be proud, men who, amid the war, rapine and conflagration that rolled through the country at the heels of the English soldiers, still strove to save from the general wreck those records of their country which to-day make the name of Ireland honorable for her antiquities, traditions and history in the eyes of the scholars of Europe. Of these men Keating, as a prose writer, was the greatest. He was a man of literature, a poet, professor, theologian and historian in one. He brought the art of writing limpid Irish to its highest perfection, and ever since the publication of his history of Ireland some two hundred and fifty years ago, the modern language may be said to have been stereotyped. Douglas Hyde, *Literary History of Ireland.* New York (Scribner's), 1899, p. 552.

Lynch, White, O'Sullivan,[3] wrote remarkable Irish histories in Latin; MacGeoghegan, at a later date, wrote the history of his native land in French, while the last of the old Irish chronicler-historians, Charles O'Conor, wrote in English, and fell in with the then young procession of critical nineteenth century scholars.[4] Mr. Comyn, in a too brief preface, notes the extensive reading, happy manner,

---

[3] John Lynch, Archdeacon of Tuam, was the author of the following works:

Eudoxus Alithinologus, Alithinologia sive veridica responsio, the Truth told, or a true answer to the invective full of falsehood, fallacies and calumnies against many of the Priests, Nobles and Irish of every rank, delivered by R(ichard) F(arrell) C(apuchin) to the Propaganda, A. D. 1659. Supplementum, 1667.

The same, (Gratianus Lucius) Cambrensis Eversus seu potius historica fides in rebus hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensi abrogata, 1662, edited with translation and notes by Matthew Kelly, Celtic Society, 3 vols. Dublin, 1848.

Pii Antistitis Icon, sive de vita et morte Rmi Francisci Kerovani Aladensis Episcopi, Maclovii (St. Malo) 1669, ed. C. P. Meehan, Dublin, 1884. Stephen White, a famous Jesuit, and author of "Apologia pro Hibernia adversus Cambri Calumnias, ed. M. Kelly, Dublin, 1849.

O'Sullevanus Bearus, Philippus, *Historiae Catholicae Hiberniae Compendium, Utissipone, 1621, edidit notisque illustravit M. Kelly, Dublin, 1850.* cf. The Four Masters, ad ann. 1601-1602, and the English account in Pacata Hibernia, Ireland appeased and reduced, or a Historie of the late Warres of Ireland, especially within the Province of Munster under the government of Sir George Carew, London, 1633; cf. also Franciscus Porter (Ord. Min. Hib.) *Compendium annalium ecclesiasticorum regni Hiberniae exhibens brevem illius descriptionem et succinctam historiam antiquitatum magis notabilium utriusque status ecclesiastici et civilis, veteris et recentioris.* Rome, 1690, 4o. On Carew, the personal enemy of Keating, see Joyce, *A Short History of Ireland* (Longmans, London, 1893), p. 528, sqq.

Latin was certainly a very usual accomplishment of Irish youth in the latter half of the sixteenth century. In his *Historie of Ireland,* Campion says (1574) that "they speak Latine liks a vulgar language learned in their schools of leachcraft and law, whereat they begin children and hold on sixteen or twentie years." When MacDermot wrote to the Governor, after the Battle of the Curlew Mountains, to inform him of the place where lay the body of Sir Conyers Clifford, he wrote in Latin. (Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 530).

"So solicitous were the heads of the great families—the O'Donnells and the MacSwynes of Fanad, for example—for the education of their people, that they took special care to settle large endowments on the houses of the new orders, which, I need not tell you, were always subject to the control of our generals and provincials. The Tertiaries, indeed, did good service in Ireland, for the liberality of the native princes enabled them to diffuse learning among the poorer classes, who were always addicted to book-lore. I myself have met peasant lads educated in those schools who were as familiar with Virgil, Horace, Homer and other classic writers as they were with the genealogies of the Milesian princes." Father Mooney, O. S. F. (1616) in *Meehan's Irish Franciscan Monasteries in the Seventeenth Century (sixth ed.)* Dublin, 1872, p. 66.

It was an Irish Jesuit, William Bathe, who first compiled in Latin the famous "Janua Linguarum" the imitation of which afterwards won for Comenius so great fame.

wealth of reference and illustration, pure local coloring and spirit, of this venerable historian. His style, says the editor, (p. V.) has a charm of its own "which quite escapes in any translation, and can only be fully appreciated by native readers, among whom his works have always enjoyed an unrivalled popularity."

The translation into English by Dermod O'Conor (1723) is pronounced a burlesque by James Hardiman, ignorant and dishonest by Dr. Todd; Mr. Comyn is content to call it unsatisfactory. William Haliday published (1811) a partial translation, and John O'Mahony (1867) gave to the world a faithful rendering of the entire work with copious and valuable notes.[5] All these translations have now become very rare—hence the timeliness of the one before us.

The principal manuscript used by Mr. Comyn is declared to be most accurate and valuable. It is now in the library of the Franciscan Convent at Dublin, whither it came, some twenty-eight years ago, after a long exile at Louvain and Rome. It was originally written, as it states, in the Convent of Kildare, probably before 1640. It is believed to be in the handwriting of Keating himself (p. XIII.). As the history was completed about 1634, we may have in this manuscript, not only the oldest existing transcript, but the original itself, a fact that reminds us of the eleventh century autograph of Marianus O'Gorman's annals yet preserved in the Vatican. Three other contemporary manuscripts, due to the learned scribes of the O'Mulconry family, have been consulted, as well as later transcripts. Keating never had the good fortune of publishing his own work, but his industry and the devoted zeal of his literary friends, says Mr. Comyn, secured its preservation. Printing in Gaelic was then rare and difficult, especially in Ireland, "but the reproduction of manuscripts was an honorable calling actively pursued, and the copies were so clearly and beautifully executed by professional scribes that the native reader was never so bereft of literature as the absence of printed books might suggest."[6]

---

[4] Abbé MacGeoghegan, History of Ireland, Ancient and Modern, Translated from the French by Patrick Kelly, Dublin, 1849.

Charles O'Conor (of Belanagar), Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores veteres: 1. Annales Inisfalenses; 2. Annales Bueliani; 3. Annales Quatuor Magistrorum; 4. Annales Ultonienses. 4 vols., Buckhinghamiae, 1814.

[5] In 1881, Dr. P. W. Joyce brought out for the use of students the first part of the Foras Feasa, with an almost literal translation and vocabulary.

The "Introduction" of Keating has recently been edited separately by Mr. Comyn for the convenience of students.

[6] The Irish having no press of their own in Ireland (though they had some outside of it) were obliged to print and set up all their books abroad, chiefly at Louvain, Antwerp, Rome and Paris. Any attempt to introduce fonts of Irish type in the teeth of the English government would, I think, have been futile, so that except for the works that they were able to print in Irish type abroad and afterwards to smuggle into Ireland during the seven-

The authentic materials for the life of Keating are meagre enough. Such as they are, they may be found in the prefaces to the editions of Haliday and O'Mahoney. He was born at Burges in Tipperary about 1570, and he died in 1650 as parish priest of Tubrid, only a few miles distant from the place of his birth. At an early age he was sent to one of the many Irish ecclesiastical schools on the Continent, probably to Bordeaux (Comyn) or to some Irish school in Spain (Hyde). From the latter quarter of the sixteenth century one evil phase of the general Elizabethan policy for Ireland contemplated compulsory ignorance and consequent barbarism for all faithful Irish Catholics. As a result, nearly every Irish clergyman of note was educated abroad.

"The same to me," says a contemporary Gael, "are mountains or ocean, Ireland or the west of Spain, I have shut and made fast the gates of sorrow over my heart."

The key-note of the English writers on Ireland is henceforth "Education" but strictly Protestant in character and content.[7] Not that Ireland had suddenly become a land of ignorance. In spite of the severe legislation against the native schools and their teachers,

---

teenth century was thrown nearly a couple of hundred years out of the world's course by having to use manuscripts instead of printed books. Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 534.

[7] "Almost every native scholar produced by Ireland in the seventeenth century," says Dr. Hyde (op. cit. pp. 560-61) seems to have been hampered by persecution in the same way as Keating, and loud and bitter were the complaints of the Irish at the policy of the English Government in cutting them off from education. Peter Lombard, the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who died in 1625, and who wrote in Latin and published—abroad of course, he would not well do it at home—a "Commentary on the Kingdom of Ireland," assures his countrymen and all Europe that it had been the steady plan of the English Government to cut off education from the Irish and to prevent them from having a university of their own, despite the keen longing which his countrymen had for liberal studies, and the way in which they had always hitherto distinguished themselves in them. Even, he asserts, while England was still Catholic, her policy had been the same, and when the question of an Irish university was being debated in the English Council it had no bitterer enemy than a celebrated English bishop. When afterwards some one remonstrated with this dignitary for opposing a work so holy and so salutary as the establishment of a Catholic University in Ireland, the answer made him was that it was not as a Catholic bishop he opposed it, but as an English senator. "Well for him," remarks Lombard, grimly, "if in the council of God and his saints, when the severe sentence of the Deity is passed upon the bishop, the senator by a like display of nimble wit may escape it!" When they did get a university it was the Elizabethan and Protestant Trinity. "Toties requsita studiorum universitas," adds Lombard, "ante annos aliquot erecta fuit decreto reginae (tametsi sumptibus indigenarum) juxta civitatem Dubliniensem, capacissimum ac splendissimum, in quo ordinatum est ut disciplinae omnes liberales traderentur, sed ab haereticis magistris, quales cum Hibernia nequaquam subministraret, ex Anglia submissi sunt." *De Hibernia Commentarius*, Louvain, 1632.

The idea of establishing a University in Ireland had been discussed since

it was still possible in Keating's youth to obtain a good classical training in one of the many Latin schools that had long flourished in Ireland, and we may well believe that he obtained therein the elements of intellectual culture and a taste for the antiquities of his country.[8] Keating no doubt gave a good account of himself in the foreign schools that he frequented—the Irish youth of that period were usually highly prized for their studiousness—"sçavoir sa théologie comme un Hibernois" became a proverb in France.[9] He returned to Ireland in 1610, and in 1615 had prepared a "Key to the

1560. As early as 1583 it was proposed to open two, one at Limerick, the other at Armagh. Finally, Trinity College was established in 1590. It was endowed with the wealth of the old Church, and to-day possesses no less than 199,573 acres—the one-hundredth part of Irish soil—and disposes of an annual revenue of some $150,000, not to speak of former generous special allowances and the twenty-one benefices to which it presents, some of which give a revenue of over $5,000. What wonder that it counts some scholars on its roll-call? cf. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Irland* (Mainz, 1890), II., 215-216. J. W. Stubbs, *History of the University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1889.

[8] On Peter White, the prince of Irish schoolmasters and his school at Waterford, in the latter years of the sixteenth century, see Hogan, *op. cit* p. 51. Anthony à Wood tells us in his Athenae Oxonienses (I. 575) that this Oxford graduate "was ejected from his deanery for his religion. He continued, notwithstanding, in his beloved faculty of pedagogy, *which was then accounted a most excellent employment in Ireland by the Catholics*, especially for this reason that the sons of noblemen and gentlemen might be trained up in their religion, and so consequently keep out Protestantcy." In 1582 the future Archbishop Skerret had a school in Galway, where he taught reading, grammar and Christian doctrine. The father of John Lynch, the famous antiquarian and sturdy defender of his country against the aspersions of Gerald Barry, kept a school at Galway that Archbishop Ussher closed in 1617, although it had been founded by the citizens, and attracted great numbers of scholars from Connaught and even the Pale.

[9] In his Treatise on the Mass (1611) Fr. Henry Fitzsimmon says: From about the year 1555, as is well known, these late heresies by force, never by voluntary allowance, oppressed religion in our country, *banished teaching, extinguished learning, exiled to foreign countries all instruction*, and forced our youth either at home to be ignorant, or abroad in poverty, rather to glean ears of learning than with leisure to reap any abundancy thereof. Yet such as traveled to foreign countr'es, notwithstanding all difficulties, often attained to singular perfection and reputation of learning in sundry sciences, to principal titles of universities, to high prelacies, of whom some are yet living, some departed in peace." Hogan, op. cit., p. 4. The letter of St. Ignatius to Cardinal Pole (1555) is well known, requesting the latter to send him talented youth from England and Ireland. On March 17, 1604, Father Aquaviva wrote that the Irish seem made for the work of the society: "admitti Hibernos desiderat omnino Pater Generalis, quum ad institutum nostrum facti quodammodo videantur humilitate, obedientia, charitate et *doctrinae laude* quibus, omnium locorum testimonio, valde excellunt." Father Hogan's eloquent and learned account of a number of seventeenth century Irish Jesuits is ample confirmation of the good judgment of the saint and his first successors. Cf. also his *Hibernia Ignatiana*, or Lives of Irish Jesuits who flourished from 1547 to 1607, and their Letters on Irish affairs." Dublin, 1880.

Shield of the Mass" (yet unpublished). Another ascetical work, "The Three Shafts of Death," was written about 1625, but was first published at Dublin in 1890 by Dr. Atkinson. In 1644 Keating built the little church of Tubrid, where he lies buried, but the precise spot is unknown. His days might have passed in tolerable calm, were it not for his courage in denouncing from the altar the improper relations of a Catholic lady with Sir George Carew, the cruel President of Munster. She set in motion against him the anti-popery laws and the good doctor was obliged to take to the mountains, where he led a wandering life for some years, particularly among the faithful tribesmen of the Glen of Aherlow.[10] Here he conceived the notion of writing anew the history of Ireland, being moved thereto by the injustice and malignity of "every modern Englishman who speaks of the country." He believed himself especially called to the work, as he was of Anglo-Norman descent—but higher qualifications lay in his early training and his possession of many valuable manuscripts long since lost.[11] Moreover, there still

[10] A good idea of the venerable historian's trials may be gained from the story of the sufferings of his brilliant contemporary, Father Henry Fitzsimon, S. J., during the winter of 1641 in the same Wicklow glens and mountains. "Winding his way by Dundrum or Terenure, through sequestered woods and dells, climbing steep hills, creeping and moving from place to place in order to escape his pursuers, traveling on foot over rough rockways, on to Glencree where the old maps mark a mountain and bog, and where he was sheltered in a shepherd's cabin in a bog. There among the faithful clans of Wicklow he was safe from the pursuit of those who thirsted for his blood; and he spent the dreary winter, or two winters exposed to the fury of storms and rain. His bed was a pad of straw, which was always wet with rain from the roof, or with "the rising and coming of the waters of the bog," while the rents in the thatch of his wretched hut allowed him to gaze on the glories of the starry heavens." Hogan, *Distinguished Irishmen of the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1894.

[11] Keating not only had with him some of the oldest books of Irish history, such as the "Book of Invasions," at the commencement of which are recorded the ancient traditions of the origin of the Milesian race, but of the successive colonizations of Erinn by the various waves of the Celtic family which reached this island from the European Continent before the time of Milidh or Milesius. And he must have had with him some collections which contained many of the pieces I have classified as the Historic Tales. Keating's work consists of nothing more than a compilation of these materials, as many as he had with him in his wanderings; and he seems to have done nothing but abridge, and arrange chronologically, such accounts of historic facts as he found in them, never departing the least from what he saw before him, and often preserving even the arrangement and the style. It is greatly to be regretted that a man so learned as Keating (one who had access, too, at some period of his life to some valuable and ancient MSS. since lost) should not have had time to apply to his materials the rigid test of that criticism so necessary to the examination of ancient tales and traditions—criticism which his learning and ability so well qualified him to undertake. As it is, however, Keating's book is of great value to the student, so far as it contains at least a fair outline of our Ancient History, and so far as regards the language in which it is written, which is regarded as

abounded in Ireland antiquarian families like the O'Clerys, genealogists like the MacFirbis (Forbes), whose noblest representative, Donald MacFirbis, contemporary of Keating, was a lineal descendant of Dathi, the last pagan monarch of Ireland, and one of whose ancestors had compiled the famous "Book of Lecan," while his own extant "Book of Genealogies" would fill 1,300 large quarto pages. MacFirbis either compiled or wrote out the "Chronicon Scotorum" and apparently from manuscripts of his family; he also "compiled a glossary of the ancient laws, of which only a fragment is preserved, and made copies of five other ancient glossaries and law tracts."

Moreover, the archaic monuments of Irish local history were yet numerous enough—topography, architecture, clan-names, tribal reminiscenes, local traditions, a multitude of dates and stories, saga-like, if we will, but rich in national sense, color and spirit. It was not yet necessary to pursue the old and the feeble to catch from their lips the last echoes of an independent racial life and ethos. The fabric of national existence, though seriously undermined and inhumanly isolated, still stood, peculiar and lonely enough, but yet an object of the most intense reverence to all Irishmen.

I.

The "Introduction" of Keating to his charming narrative of Irish history is so fresh and personal, breathes so vividly and forcefully the spirit of his own time, that our readers will scarcely be displeased

---

a good specimen of the Gaedhlic of his time." Cf. O'Curry, *Manuscript Materials of Irish History*, p. 441.

Among the most valuable ancient books of Irish history now apparently hopelessly lost are the following: Tain Bo Chuailgne, or Cattle Spoil of Cooley, The Cuilmenn or Great Skin Book, The Saltair of Tara, The Book of the Uaconghbail (O'Connell), extant at Kildare in 1626; The Cin of Drum Snechta, The Books of Saint Longarad, The Book of St. Mochta, The Book of Cuana.

Of the following almost all existed prior to the year 1100: The Book of Dubhdaleithe; The original Leabhar na h'Uidhre, or Book of the Dun Cow; A volume known as "The Book Eaten by the Poor People in the Desert;" The Short Book of Monasterboice; The Red Book of Mac Egan; The Book of Leithlin; The Book of O'Scoba of Clonmacnois; The "Duil" of Drom Ceat; The Book of Clonsost; the Book of Cluain Eidhneach; The Saltair of Cashel; The Yellow Book of Slane; The Books of Eochaidh O'Flanagan; The Book of Inis an Dúin; The Book of Flann of Monasterboice; The Book of Flann of Dungiven; The Book of Downpatrick; the Book of Derry; The Book of Sábhal Patrick; The Black Book of St. Molaga; The Yellow Book of St. Molling; The Yellow Book of Mac Murrough; The Book of Armagh (not the one extant).

"The books of saga, poetry and annals that have come down to our day, though so vastly more ancient and numerous than anything that the rest of Western Europe has to show, are yet an almost unappreciable fragment of the literature that at one time existed in Ireland." (Hyde, op. cit., p. 263.)

to hear some echoes of the first of modern historians of Ireland. What rouses the ire of Keating is the old note of hatred and self-interest, reinforced by the written calumny, the old note of violent injustice allied with the arrogance and superciliousness of a scholarship that was too racial in its character, too exclusively national in its scope, in time made fiercely narrow and intolerant by the added antithesis of religious warfare.

The reader will remember that the Ireland of Keating's youth was still a national entity, with its ancient constitution operative, its immemorial legislation still working, both in written code and consuetudinary acceptance, with an intense primitive individualism that manifested itself in the superb personalities of men like Shane O'Neill, Sir Cahir O'Doherty, Donal O'Sullivan Beare, Tyrone, Tyrconnell, and a hundred others—men whose praises are often in the mouths of those old European chroniclers who have related for us the moving continental drama of the later sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries. Never was the national self-consciousness of Ireland clearer, holier, than from the death of Elizabeth to the death of Charles I. (1603-1649), precisely the flower of Keating's manhood.[12] The native learning, refinement, life-philosophy, imbibed from the remotest past, enhanced by the picturesque and significant customs of an eminently social and lively race, emphasized by contrast with a certain prosy dulness and vulgarity of the Calvinist Sassenach, never seemed things of a higher value, or more worth fighting and dying for than during the days when the political success of Protestantism was still an open question, both in England and on the Continent, when it was still uncertain that the Middle Age, with its world of splendid ideals and hopes, its rich cycle of romantic yearnings and affections, was declining or even dead.

In the opening words of Keating there is something grave and magisterial, as befits him who was the first to be the intermediary to the modern world of the story of ancient Scotia. Before him there had been admirable annalists, and their work was even then

[12] The first half of the seventeenth century saw an extraordinary reawakening of the Irish literary spirit. This was the more curious because it was precisely at this period that the old Gaelic polity, with its habitual system, brehon law, hereditary bards, and all its other supports, was being upheaved by main force and already beginning to totter to its ruin. This was the period when to aggravate what was already to the last degree bitter—the struggle for the soil and the racial feuds—a third disastrous ingredient, polemics, stepped in, and inflamed the minds of the opposing parties with the additional fanaticism of religious hatred. Yet, whether it is that their works have been better preserved to us than those of any other century, or whether the very nearness of the end inspired them to double exertions, certain it is that the seventeenth century, and especially the first half of it, produced among the Irish a number of most gifted men of letters." Hyde, op. cit., p. 514.

culminating in the Annals of Donegal (Four Masters), in some senses the most unique of all the historical enterprises of the daring seventeenth century. After these writers, the way was open for that large philosophic history of Ireland which yet awaits its Von Ranke or its Michelet. And while Keating's narrative is far from the formal perfection of numerous modern historians, it is so only because, unlike them, he was the first to beat out his own path. Had there been more English scholarship like that of Ussher and Sir James Ware, broad, intelligent, even somewhat sympathetic, and less like that of Edmund Spenser and the Elizabethan historians whom the latter helped to indoctrinate, it would have been better for the world of letters. A multitude of curious documents, the product of the peculiar and isolated, but highly original and archaic, Gaelic culture of the Middle Ages would have reached our own time, and all the smaller sciences that live on the crumbs which fall from the splendid banquet table of History would be to-day incredibly richer. The "spacious times of great Elizabeth" would not be disfigured by the red streak of blood that no ingenuity can erase, no cant explain away. We should not have had to wait for a Macpherson to enrich the literatures of modern times with the glorious melancholy of the Ossianic soul-searchings, nor for a Burke and a Grattan to endow English rhetoric with a new stream of Keltic color and music that often raises it well nigh the level of the best Greek speech, nor for a Gaston Paris and a D'Arbois de Jubainville to reveal the true sources of mediæval romanticism, nor for a Zeuss and a Diefenbach to reconstruct that daily speech of Patrick and Brigid and Columbkille in which they won away from pagan Ireland its great heart and laid it at the feet of Jesus Christ, perhaps the richest and most influential, certainly the sincerest of His conquests.

"Whosoever proposes," says Keating, in his opening paragraph, "to trace and follow up the ancient history and origin of any country ought to determine on setting down plainly the method which reveals most clearly the truth of the state of the country, and the condition of the people who inhabit it: and forasmuch as I have undertaken to investigate the groundwork of Irish historical knowledge, I have thought at the outset of deploring some part of her affliction and of her unequal contest; especially the unfairness which continues to be practised on her inhabitants, alike the old foreigners who are in possession more than four hundred years from the Norman invasion down, as well as the native Irish who have had possession during almost three thousand years. For there is no historian of all those who have written on Ireland from that epoch that has not continuously sought to cast reproach and blame both on the old foreign settlers and on the native Irish.

Whereof the testimony given by Cambrensis, Spenser, Stanihurst, Hanmer, Camden, Barckly, Moryson, Davies, Campion, and every other new foreigner who has written on Ireland from that time, may bear witness; inasmuch as it is almost according to the fashion of the beetle they act, when writing concerning the Irish.[13] For it is the fashion of the beetle,

[13] Fynes Moryson (1566-1617?) An Itinerary by Fynes Moryson, Gent, of ten years travel through the twelve domains of Germany, Bohmerland, Switzerland, Netherland, Denmark, Poland, England, Scotland and Ireland.

when it lifts its head in the summertime, to go about fluttering, and not to stoop towards any delicate flower that may be in the field, or any blossom in the garden, though they be all roses or lilies, but it keeps bustling about until it meets with dung of horse or cow, and proceeds to roll itself therein. Thus it is with the set above-named; they have displayed no inclination to treat of the virtues or good qualities of the nobles among the old foreigners and the native Irish who then dwelt in Ireland; such as to write on their valour and on their piety, on the number of abbeys they had founded, and what land and endowments for worship they had bestowed on them; on the privileges they had granted to the learned professors of Ireland, and all the reverence they manifested towards churchmen and prelates: on every immunity they secured for their sages, and the maintenance they provided for the poor and the orphans; on each donation they were wont to bestow on the learned and on petitioners, and on the extent of their hospitality to guests, insomuch that it cannot truthfully be said that there ever existed in Europe folk who surpassed them in their own time, in generosity or in hospitality, according to their ability. Bear witness the literary assemblies

---

1 vol. folio, London, 1617. The part concerning Ireland was republished in 1735 at Dublin,, under the title, A History of Ireland, 1599. 1605; also in Henry Morley's Carisbrooke Library, 1890.

Sir John Davies (1569-1626). A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the beginning of his Majestie's happie Reign, London, 1612.

Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618), translator of Vergil, uncle of Archbishop Ussher, descendant of an old Anglo-Irish family of Dublin, wrote in 1569 for the first volume of Holinshed's Chronicles, a History of Ireland. It was first published with Stanyhurst's Description of Ireland, 1586-87. It was reprinted by Ware in his History of Ireland (1633) at the same time as Spenser's View of the State of Ireland, written in 1596, but then published for the first time. Later Stanyhurst became a Catholic, and retired to the Continent where he published "De rebus in Hibernia gestis," Antwerp, 1584. He is said to have regretted his unfavorable attitude toward the Catholic Irish.

Meredith Hanmer (1543-1604) A Chronicle of Ireland, published for the first time by James Ware in 1633. Hanmer was the first translator into English of the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret and Evagrius, London, 1577. He held several benefices in Ireland under the Establishment (1591-1603).

Edmund Campion, The Historie of Ireland, 1569, published first by Richard Stanyhurst in Holinshed's Chronicles, 1586-87, and reprinted in Sir James Ware's History of Ireland. Dublin, 1633, also by the Hibernia Press, Dublin, 1809. Campion wrote among other things a brochure "De Jure Academico" (De Homine Academico) Dublin, 1569, Antwerp, 1632, a kind of sketch of the university man, especially the ecclesiastical student. It is found in his "Opuscula Omnia," Vienna ed., 1679. For a full account of the blessed martyr Campion see Gillow's "Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics," Vol. I. He got his knowledge of Ireland during a brief stay at Dublin among the Anglo-Irish Stanyhursts, and others of the dominating class.

A curious specimen of contemporary English ideas of the native Irish is the now very rare blackletter poem, dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney and lately offered for sale at Murray's, "The Image of Irelande, with a Discoverie of Woodkarne, wherein is moste lively expressed, the Nature and Qualitie of the jaied *(sic)* Wilde Irishe Woodkarne, their notable aptnesse celeritie and pronesse to Rebellion..also their habite and apparell is there plainly showne. The Execrable Life and miserable of Rorio Roge..lastly the Commyng in of the greate Oneale of Irelande to the Right Honourable Sir Henry Sidney (Lord Deputie), etc., made and devised anno 1578 and published by the saied Authour, this present yere of Our Lorde 1581, for pleasure and delight of the well disposed reader."

which were proclaimed by them, a custom not heard of among any other people in Europe, so that the stress of generosity and hospitality among the old foreigners and the native Irish of Ireland was such that they did not deem it sufficient to give to any who should come seeking relief, but issued a general invitation summoning them, in order to bestow valuable gifts and treasure on them. However, nothing of all this is described in the works of the present-day foreigners, but they take notice of the ways of inferiors and wretched little hags, ignoring the worthy actions of the gentry: yet as far as regards the old Irish, who were inhabiting this island before the Norman invastion, let it appear whether there has been in Europe any people more valiant than they, contending with the Romans for the defense of Scotland." (Op. cit. p. 3.)

In the timidity of Greeks and Romans before distant and unexplored seas the ancient Irish found freedom from invasion, but not from the misrepresentation of that peculiar gossip which the sea-life breeds, either on board ship, or in the intervals of harbor-idleness and ease. In the folios of old Bouquet one may find collected all the wild and improbable, certainly unsubstantiated, sailor-talk and trader-talk that was current within the civilized world of Greece and Rome about the outlying masses of Keltdom. They were "barbarians" as much as Teutons and Scythians, and the Greek genius was as little conscientious in regard to their international repute as the Roman genius was equitable in its political dealings with that world of humankind that lay outside the "orbis terrarum" or the Cosmopolis of the great Inland Sea. To the geographer Strabo and the polyhistor Solinus Keating pays his respects. Curiously enough it is an Irish hand, in all probability, which transcribed for us the manuscript of Solinus that has saved his text for the printer. Certainly he was known and used at the court of Charlemagne by the Irish geographer, Dicuil of Cluanmicnois, and the Irish savant, Dungal, whose books were once the pride of the library of Bobbio. Nor is it so strange, when we remember that by the same hands were transcribed and saved the surveys of the Roman Empire, notably that of the end of the fourth century under Theodosius.

"There are some ancient authors who lay lying charges against the Irish; such as Strabo, who says in his fourth book that the Irish are man-eating people. My answer to Strabo is, that it is a lie for him to say that the Irish are a people who eat human flesh; for it is not read in the ancient record that there was ever one in Ireland who used to eat human flesh, but Eithne the loathsome, daughter of Criomhthann, son of Eanna Cinnsiolach, king of Leinster, who was in fosterage with the Deisi of Munster: and she was reared by them on the flesh of children, in hope that thereby she would be sooner marriageable. For it had been promised to them that they should receive land from the man to whom she would be married; and it is to Aonghus, son of Nadfraoch, king of Munster, she was married, as we shall relate hereafter in the body of the history. Understand, reader, since the antiquaries do not suppress this disgusting fact, which was a reproach to the daughter of a king of Leinster, and the wife of a king of Munster, that they would not conceal, without recounting it in the case of lesser people than they, if it had been a custom practised in Ireland: wherefore it is false for Strabo to say that it was a custom for the Irish to eat human flesh, since this was never done among them but by the aforesaid girl, and even that in time of paganism. My answer also to St. Jerome, who relates this same thing, writing against Jovinian, is that it must have been a base asserter of lies who informed him, and therefore it ought not be brought as a charge against the Irish.

Solinus, in the twenty-first chapter, says that there are no bees in Ire-

land; and he says, that it is from the point of a sword the first bit is tasted by a male child in Ireland. He says, moreover, that the Irishman is wont, when his enemy is slain by him, to bathe himself in the blood. It is clear from the ancient record, which will be (found) in the history, that every one of these things is false. Pomponius Mela, in the third book, says these words, speaking of the Irish, "a people ignorant of all the virtues:" and so of many other ancient foreign authors who wrote rashly without evidence concerning Ireland, on the lying statements of false witnesses, whom it would not be right to trust in such a matter: wherefore, Camden, setting down the testimony of these people concerning Ireland, says these words: "We have not (says he) credible witness of these things." It is clear that it is false to say that there were not bees in Ireland, according to the same Camden, where he says, speaking of Ireland: "Such is the quantity of bees there, that it is not alone in apiaries or in hives they are found, but (also) in trunks of trees, and in holes of the ground." (Ibid, p. 9.)

II.

The malevolent ignorance of Gerald Barry was always to the Irish a stone of scandal. This brilliant war correspondent of the time of Henry II. flitted about Ireland for a few months in the wake of the iron knights who overthrew the light-armed natives, and demonstrated the value of stone castles as against painted wattle-burgs, somewhat as the modern cruiser humiliated the old line-of-battle ship. Half-Welshman, half-Norman, he was just the man to tickle the ears of a multitude of Oxford undergraduates with the story of the uncouth ways of innermost Ireland.[14] The looseness and inaccuracy of this writer are briefly exposed by Keating; a more complete demolition awaited him at the hands of Dr. Lynch in his "Cambrensis Eversus."

"Cambrensis says, in his twenty-second chapter, that whenever the nobles of Ireland are making a compact with each other, in presence of a bishop, they kiss at that time a relic of some saint, and that they drink each other's blood, and at that same time they are ready to perpetrate any treachery on each other. My answer to him here (is) that there is not a lay or a letter, of old record or of ancient text, chronicle or annals, supporting him in this lie: and, moreover, it is evident that it was obligatory on the antiquaries not to conceal the like of this evil custom, and even to put it in (their) manuscript on pain of losing their professorship, if it had been practised in Ireland. Wherefore it is clear that it is a lie Cambrensis has uttered here. Cambrensis says, in his tenth chapter, that the Irish are an inhospitable nation: here is what he says: 'Moreover, this nation is an inhospitable nation' (says he). However, I think Stanihurst sufficient in his history by way of reply to him in this matter; here is what he says, speaking of the generosity of the Irish: 'Verily (he says), they are a most hospitable people; and there is no greater degree in which you may earn their gratitude, than freely, and of your own will, to make your resort their houses.' Hence it may be inferred, without leave of Cambrensis that they are hospitable people, (and) truly generous in regard to food. Cambrensis says, where he writes concerning Ireland, that it was the wife of the king of Meath who eloped with Diarmuid of the foreigners; yet this is not true for him, but she was the wife of Tighearnan O'Ruairc, King of Brefny, and daughter of Murchadh, son of Flann, son of Maoilseachlainn, king of Meath, and Dearbhforgaill was her name. He says, moreover, that it is from Sliev Bloom the Suir, Nore, and Barrow take their rise, though that is not true for him, for it is clear that it is from the brow of Sliev Bloom, on the east side, the Barrow springs, and that it is from the brow of Sliev Aldun, which is called the mountain of Gap in Ikerrin, the Suir and the Nore rise." (Ibid, p. 19.)

[14] Giraldus Cambrensis, Works, edited by J. S. Brewer and James F. Dimock. 7 vols. 1861-1877 (Rolls Series). Cf. especially the "Expugnatio" and the "Topographia."

One of the curiosities of English literature is the poet Spenser's work on Ireland.[15] The Irish problem was then, as now, the thorn in the side of England; the poet, as the holder of a petty Irish office, has only counsels of cruelty and despair—his book breathes none of the spirit of the "Faery Queen," most of which, nevertheless, he wrote in Ireland,

"amongst the coolly shade
Of the green alders, by the Mulla's shore."

The sacerdotal soul of Keating holds no resentment against the unfortunate victim of his own harsh and despotic counsels, yet his falsehoods, inaccuracy, and incompetency in the matter of Irish history must needs be rebuked:

"Spenser, in his narrative, says that Egfrid, king of the Northumbrians, and Edgar, king of Britain, had authority over Ireland, as may be read in the thirty-third page of his history: yet this is not true for him, because the old records of Ireland are opposed to that, and, moreover, British authors themselves confess that the Saxons did not leave them any ancient texts, or monuments, by which they might know the condition of the time which preceded the Saxons. For Gildas, an ancient British author says, that the monuments, and consequently the history of the Britons, were destroyed by the Romans and by the Saxons. Samuel Daniel, in the first part of his chronicle, agrees with this author on the same matter, and Rider, in the Latin Dictionary he wrote, where he treats of this word Britannia; moreover he says, that it is not from Brutus Britain is called Britannia, and, if it were, that it should be Brutia or Brutica it should be called; and it were likely, if it had been from Brutus it was named, that Julius Caesar, Cornelius Tacitus, Diodorus Siculus, or Bede, or some other ancient author would have stated whence is this word Britannia; and they knew not whence is the name of their own country, it was no wonder they should be in ignorance of many of the ancient concerns of Britain, and therefore, it is not strange that Spenser likewise should be ignorant of them." (Ibid, p. 25.)

Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618) contributed no little to the caricature that long passed for true Irish history in the best society of England: *odisse quem lacseris* seems to have been his motto. His contributions to the first volume of Holinshed's Chronicles and his later account of Irish history printed on the Continent, whither he had fled from the vengeance of Elizabeth, irritated not a little the Irish, all the more as, in the meantime, Stanyhurst had passed over to the Catholic faith. This fantastic translator of Vergil was the uncle of Archbishop Ussher, and was descended from an Anglo-Irish family long settled in the land, and prominent in the English administration. Of his writings on Ireland, Sir James Ware said that they indulged in malicious misrepresentation, and in the Dictionary of National Biography Sidney Lee accuses him of want of

[15] "It is certain that the reign of Elizabeth was the great crisis of modern Ireland. It is certain that succeeding reigns, with a few brief exceptions, adopted with greater or less severity, the maxims of Elizabeth's policy; and it is equally certain that whatever was irritating or oppressive in that policy was, if not originated, at least recommended by the gentle Spenser." *Dublin Review*, Vol. XIII. (I. Series), pp. 415-416. "He found England prejudiced, he confirmed her; he found Ireland miserable, and plunged her still deeper in the gulf" (ibid, p. 445).

sympathy with the natives and of "prejudiced misrepresentation." It was from the Stanyhurst circle that Campion drew his erroneous judgments on the character and temper of the Irish.

Of the latter's work, Dr. Gillow says that Campion devoted ten weeks to its hasty composition, and that it is to be looked on less as serious history than as a pamphlet to prove that education was the only means of taming the Irish.[16] The cruel heart of Elizabeth needed first some Christian training, as the fate of Campion himself would one day prove. This blot on the illustrious Jesuit's career was washed out in his martyr's blood.

"From the worthlessness of the testimony Stanihurst gives concerning the Irish, I consider that he should be rejected as a witness, because it was purposely at the instigation of a party who were hostile to the Irish that he wrote contemptuously of them; and, I think, that hatred of the Irish must have been the first dug he drew after his first going into England to study, and that it lay as a weight on his stomach till, having returned to Ireland, he ejected it by his writing. I deem it no small token of the aversion he had for the Irish, that he finds fault with the colonists of the English province for that they did not banish the Gaelic from the country at the time when they routed the people who were dwelling in the land before them. He also says, however excellent the Gaelic language may be, that whoever smacks thereof, would likewise savour of the ill manners of the folk whose language it is. What is to be understood from this, but that Stanihurst had so great a hatred for the Irish, that he deemed it an evil that it was a Christian-like conquest the Gall had achieved over Ireland and the Gael, and not a pagan conquest. For, indeed, he who makes a Christian conquest thinks it sufficient to obtain submission and fidelity from the people who have been subdued by him, and to send from himself other new people to inhabit the land over which his power has prevailed, together with the people of that country. Moreover, it is the manner of him who makes a pagan conquest, to bring destruction on the people who are subdued by him, and to send new people from himself to inhabit the country which he has taken by force. But he who makes a Christian conquest extinguishes not the language which was before him in any country which he brings under control: it is thus William the Conqueror did as regards the Saxons. He did not extinguish the language of the Saxons, seeing that he suffered the people who used that language to remain in that country, so that it resulted therefrom that the language has been preserved from that time down among the Saxons. Howbeit, it is a pagan conquest which Hengist, the chief of the Saxons made over the Britons, since he swept them from the soil of Britain, and sent people from himself in their places; and having altogether banished every one, he banished their language with them. And it is the same way Stanihurst would desire to act by the Irish; for it is not possible to banish the language without banishing the folk whose language it is; and, inasmuch as he had the desire of banishing the people whose language it was, and, accordingly, he was hostile to the Irish; and so his testimony concerning the Irish ought not to be received.

"Stanihurst also finds fault with the lawgivers of the country, and with its physicians: although I wonder how he ventured to find fault with them, seeing that he understood neither of them, nor the language in which the skill of either class found expression, he being himself ignorant and uninformed as regards the Gaelic, which was their language, and in which the legal decisions of the country and the (books of) medicine were written. For he was not capable of reading either the law of the land or the medicine in their own language, and if they had been read to him, he had no comprehension of them. Accordingly, I think that it is the same case with him, depreciating the two faculties we have mentioned, and the case of the blind man who would discriminate the colour of one piece of cloth from another: for as the blind man cannot give a decision between the two colours, because he does not see either of them, in like manner, it was not possible for him to form a judgment between the two aforesaid faculties, inasmuch as he never understood the books in which they were written, and did not even

[16] Dictionary of National Biography, vol. LIV., p. 90, cf. Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics, vol. I., 376.

understand the doctors whose arts these were, because the Gaelic alone was their proper language, and he was out and out ignorant of it." (Ibid, p. 35.)

No profession in sixteenth and seventeenth century Ireland was more odious to the English government than the strolling harper. Quick of wit, free and bold and biting in speech, bound by ties of blood to the great chieftains and ecclesiastics, himself an archaic element of the constitution, the walking embodiment of "Irishry," the very tocsin of rebellion, the prophet of a passionate mystic, uncompromising nationalism, he was also the pamphleteer and the journalist of the day, dreaded beyond measure by the great folk of Dublin Castle. Hence the antipathy of the class from which Stanyhurst sprang.

He finds fault also with those who play the harp in Ireland, and says, that they have no music in them. It is likely that he was not a judge of any sort of music, and especially of Irish music, he being unacquainted with the rules which appertain to it. I think Stanihurst has not understood that it is thus Ireland was (being) a kingdom apart by herself, like a little world, and that the nobles and the learned who were long ago arranged to have jurisprudence, medicine, poetry, and music established in Ireland with appropriate regulations; and, therefore, it was not seemly for him to have formed and delivered a hasty rash judgment censuring the music of Ireland. It is a marvel to me that he had not read Cambrensis in the nineteenth chapter, where he praises the music of the Irish, unless it were that he had determined to attain a degree beyond Cambrensis in disparaging the Irish: for there is nothing at all in which Cambrensis more commends Irishmen than in the Irish music. Here is what he says in the same chapter: "Instruments of music alone I find the diligence of this nation praiseworthy, in which, above every nation that we have seen, they are incomparably skilful." As he says further, according to the same chapter, here is the information he gives concerning Irish music, praising it: "Their melody," says he, "is perfected and harmonized by an easy quickness, by a dissimilar equality, and by a discordant concord." From this it may be understood, on the testimony of Cambrensis, that it is false for Stanihurst to say that there is no music in Irish melody. It is not true for him, either, what he says, that the greater part of the singing folk of Ireland are blind; for it is clear that, at the time he wrote his history, there was a greater number of persons with eyesight engaged in singing and playing than of blind people, so from that down, and now, the evidence may rest on our contemporaries.

"Understand, reader, that Stanihurst was under three deficiencies for writing the history of Ireland, on account of which it is not fit to regard him as an historian. In the first place, he was too young, so that he had not had opportunity for pursuing inquiry concerning the antiquity of this country, on which he undertook to write. The second defect, he was blindly ignorant in the language of the country in which were the ancient records and transactions of the territory, and of every people who had inhabited it; and, therefore, he could not know these things. The third defect, he was ambitious, and accordingly, he had expectation of obtaining an advantage from those whom he was incited to write evil concerning Ireland: and, moreover, on his having subsequently become a priest, he promised to recall most part of the contemptuous things he had written concerning Ireland, and I hear that it is now in print, to be exhibited in Ireland." (Ibid, p. 39.)

Not all the writers of Ireland were hopelessly prejudiced, Keating can cite, without blame, the antiquarian jurist Camden, in his description of the peculiar system by which law, medicine, history, racial tradition and custom, were handed down among the Irish. The more intimate knowledge of the native historian permits him to add life and color to the barren statement of the English judge.

Even to-day, we must admire their excellent ancient provisions for the storing of erudition, its immunity and unbroken use.

"Camden says it is a system among the Irish for their nobles to have lawgivers, physicians, antiquaries, poets and musicians, and for endowments to be bestowed on them, and also their persons, lands, and property to enjoy immunity. Here is what he says speaking of them: "These princes (he says) have their own lawgivers, whom they call 'brehons,' their historians for writing their actions, their physicians, their poets, whom they name 'bards,' and their singing men, and the land appointed to each one of these, and each of them dwelling on his own land, and, moreover every one of them of a certain family apart; that is to say, the judges of one special tribe and surname, the antiquaries or historians of another tribe and surname, and so to each one from that out, they bring up their children and their kinsfolk, each one of them in his own art, and there are always successors of themselves in these arts.'[17]

"From these words of Camden it is clear that the order is good which the Irish had laid down for preserving these arts in Ireland from time to time. For they assigned professional lands to each tribe of them, in order that they might have sustenance for themselves for the cultivation of the arts, that poverty should not turn them away; and, moreover, it is the most proficient individual of one tribe or the other who would obtain the professorship of the prince of the land which he held; and it used to result from that that every one of them would make his best efforts to be well versed in his own art in the hope of obtaining the professorship in preference to the rest of his tribe: and it is thus it is done beyond the sea now by many who go to obtain (college) chairs in consideration of their learning. It was all the more possible to preserve these arts, as the nobility of Ireland had appointed that the land, the persons and the property of the 'ollavs' should enjoy security and protection; for when the native Irish and the foreigners would be contending with each other, they should not cause trouble or annoyance to the professors, or to the pupils who were with them for instruction, hindering them from cultivating the arts. It is read in Julius Caesar, in the sixth book of his history, that the 'druids' who came from the west of Europe to direct schools in France enjoyed a similar immunity, and I think that it was from Ireland they brought that custom with them." (Ibid, p. 71.)

III.

To-day, there is something pathetic in the insistence of Keating that only those were fit to write the history of Ireland who knew the tongue in which its annals were written. The magnificent and equal justice of modern science has called before its bar and condemned all writers who dare to meddle with the facts of history without sufficient understanding of the original dress in which these facts were clothed, which dress is usually like the original atmosphere, the sunlight, in which the events took place, and therefore itself a superior medium of intelligence and judgment.[18] Let it be

[17] Habent hi magnates suos iuridicos, quos vocant Brehonos, suos historicos, qui res gestas describunt, medicos, poetas, quos bardos vocant, et citharaedos, quibus singulis sua praedia assignata sunt, et singuli sunt in unoquoque territorio, et e certis et singulis familiis; scilicet, brehoni unius stirpis et nominis, historici alterius, et sic de coeteris, qui suos liberos sive cognatos in sua qualibet arte erudiunt, et semper successores habent. Cf. Lawrence Ginnell, *The Brehon Laws*, London (Fisher Unwin), 1894.

[18] To Irish writers of the period in question, the English contempt for the original sources of Irish history was all the more aggravating by reason of the peculiar personal reverence for the primitive annalists and historians of Ireland—for the most part, venerable clerics, monks, missionaries and bishops.

"The historians and synchronisms of Erin were written and tested in the

recalled that when Keating wrote, the nation of Ireland in its entirety yet spoke Irish, and that the contemptuous ignoring of the rich and beloved national literature was all the more keenly felt. Alas! it was not truth but victory that was then being sought, not the larger knowledge but broader possessions, not an enrichment of the mind, but the extermination of an old and meritorious Christian race that had been for centuries schoolmaster to them who were now its despoilers and executioners.

"The refutation of these new foreign writers need not be pursued by us any further, although there are many things they insert in their histories which it would be possible to confute; because, as to the most part of what they write disparagingly of Ireland, they have no authority for writing it but repeating the tales of false witnesses who were hostile to Ireland, and ignorant of her history: for it is certain that the learned men who were conversant with antiquity in Ireland did not undertake to enlighten them in it, and, so, it was not possible for them to have knowledge of the history and the ancient state of Ireland. And Cambrensis, who undertook to supply warrant for everything, it is like in his case that it was a blind man or a blockhead who gave him such a shower of fabulous information so that he has left the invasion of the Tuatha De Danann without making mention of it, although they were three years short of two hundred in the headship of Ireland, and that there were nine kings of them in the sovereignty of Ireland: and (yet) he had recounted the first invasions of Ireland, although it were only the invasion of Ceasair, and that the antiquaries do not regard it for certain as an invasion, notwithstanding that it is mentioned by them in their books. Truly I think that he took no interest in investigating the antiquity of Ireland, but that the reason why

---

presence of those illustrious saints as is manifest in the great books that are are named after the saints themselves and from their great churches; for there was not an illustrious church in Erin that has not a great book of history named from it or from the saints who sanctified it. It would be easy, too, to know from the books which the saints wrote, and the songs of praise which they composed in Irish that they themselves and their churches were the centres of the true knowledge, and the archives and homes of the manuscripts of the authors of Erin in the elder times. But alas! short was the time until dispersion and decay overtook the churches of the saints; their relics and their books; for there is not to be found of them now (1631) but a small remnant that has not been carried away into distant countries and foreign nations—carried away so that their fate is unknown from that time unto this." Michael O'Clery, Preface to Book of Invasions, written in 1631.

"It is absolutely necessary to study the poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, if one would come to a right understanding of the great transformation scene then being enacted. The feelings, aspirations, and politics of the Irish themselves are faithfully reflected in them, and though no Irish historian, except perhaps O'Halloran, has ever read them, yet no historian can afford to utterly neglect them. It has become common of late years to deny that there was any real national struggle of Ireland against England in the seventeenth century, and my friend Mr. Standish O'Grady, in particular, from a perusal of the English State Papers and other documents, has striven with eloquence and brilliancy to prove that the fight was a social and an economic one, a conflict between the smaller gentry and the great upper lords. But such a view of the case is greatly contracted (indeed, absolutely disproved) by a study of the Irish bards. The names of Erin, Banba, Fodhla, the Plain of Conn, the Land of the Children of Ir and Eber, are in their mouths at every moment, and to the very last they persisted in their efforts to combine the Gael against the Gall." Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 525.

he set about writing of Ireland is to give false testimony concerning her people during his own time, and their ancestors before them: and, besides, it was but brief opportunity he had for research on the history of Ireland, since he spent but a year and a half at it before going (back) to England; and his history not being finished (in that time), he left a half year's portion wanting to be completed of it under the care of a companion of his, named Bertram Verdon.

"Wherefore, I hope that whatsoever impartial reader shall read every refutation which I make on Cambrensis, and on these new foreigners who follow his track, will trust the refutation I make on their lines rather than the story-telling they all do, for I am old, and a number of these were young; I have seen and I understand the chief historical books, and they did not see them, and if they had seen them, they would not have understood them. It is not for hatred nor for love of any set of people beyond another, nor at the instigation of any one, nor with the expectation of obtaining profit from it, that I set forth to write the history of Ireland, but because I deem it was not fitting that a country so honourable as Ireland, and races so noble as those who have inhabited it, should go into oblivion without mention or narration being left of them: and I think that my estimate in the account I give concerning the Irish ought the rather to be accepted, because it is of the Gaels I chiefly treat. Whoever thinks it much I say for them, it is not to be considered that I should deliver judgment through favour, giving them much praise beyond what they have deserved, being myself of the old Galls as regards my origin." (Ibid, p. 75.)

It is with pardonable pride that Keating rehearses the right of an Irishman to be heard in the house of Clio. His reference to the "companies" of learned and holy Irishmen, who flooded the continent in earlier times no longer excites surprise. But the student of history is painfully affected when he hears the roll-call of many "illuminated books of Erin" that are no longer known. *Habent sua fata libelli,* but that of these valuable Irish miscellaneous manuscripts is, indeed, a sad one. They reached the O'Clerys and the Keatings, the disciples of Louvain and Salamanca, and then they fell a prey to that fate which loving hands had for so many centuries turned aside. Their "keepers" were exiled, impoverished; the lands confiscated that were once the endowments of these venerable books; the faith they illustrated, and in their fragments yet richly illustrate, was proscribed on the green hills and in the fertile vales that it had made famous throughout Christendom for ten centuries. The mild and humane philosophy they stood for was passing from the stage of human affairs, to make way for insatiable greed, license of desire, infinity of ambition. To the ecclesiastical historian—and the history of Ireland is hopelessly interwoven with that of the Church—this list of Keating, as quoted above, will be forever a root of sorrow. What problems did those books solve? What broken spaces of history did they bridge over? What errors of fact, appreciation, hypothesis, would they control and correct? What personalities would they light up, and what institutions would they outline more vividly? We repine in vain: the silent waters of Lethe have closed above their painted pages, and we now pursue rare and fitful echoes in fields where once moved a procession of witnesses.

If, indeed, it be that the soil is commended by every historian who writes on Ireland, the race is dispraised by every new foreign historian who writes about it, and it is by that I was incited to write this history concerning the

Irish, owing to the extent of the pity I felt at the manifest injustice which is done to them by those writers. If only indeed they had given their proper estimate to the Irish, I know not why they should not put them in comparison with any nation in Europe in three things, namely, in valour, in learning, and in being steadfast in the Catholic faith: and forasmuch as regards the saints of Ireland, it needs not to boast what a multitude they were, because the foreign authors of Europe admit this, and they state that Ireland was more prolific in saints than any country in Europe; and, moreover, they admit that the dominion of learning in Ireland was so productive, that she sent forth from her learned companies to France, to Italy, to Germany, to Flanders, to England, and to Scotland, as is clear from the introduction to the book in which were written in English lives of Patrick, Columcille, and Brigit; and forasmuch as concerns the ancient history of Ireland, it may be assumed that it was authoritative, because it used to be revised at the assembly of Tara every third year, in presence of the nobility, the clergy, and the learned of Ireland; and since the Irish received the faith, it has been placed under the sanction of the prelates of the Church. These chief books following which are still to be seen, will testify to this; namely, the Book of Armagh; the 'Saltair' of Cashel, which holy Cormac, son of Cuileannan, king of the two provinces of Munster and archbishop of Cashel, wrote; the Book of Uachongbhail; the Book of Cluainedhneach of Fionntan in Leix; the 'Saltair na rann,' which Aonghus the 'Culdee' wrote; the Book of Glendaloch; the Book of Rights, which holy Benen, son of Sesgnen wrote; the 'Uidhir' of Ciaran, which was written in Clonmacnois; the Yellow Book of Moling and the Black Book of Molaga. Here follows a summary of the books which were written in those, namely, the book of Invasion, the book of the Provinces, the Roll of Kings, the book of tribes, the book of synchronism, the book of famous places, the book of remarkable women, the book which was called 'Cóir anmann;' the book which was called 'Uraicheapt,' which Ceannfaolaidh the learned wrote, and the book which is called 'Amhra' of Columcille, which Dallan Forgaill wrote shortly after the death of Columcille. There are yet to be seen in Ireland many other histories, besides the chief books which we have mentioned, in which there is much of ancient record to be discovered, such as the battle of Magh Muccraimhe, the siege of Druim Damhghaire, the fates of the knights, the battle of Crionna, the battle of Fionnchoradh, the battle of Ros-na-Ríogh, the battle of Magh Leana, the battle of Magh Rath, the battle of Magh Tualaing, and many other histories which we shall not mention here. Furthermore, the historical record of Ireland should be considered as authoritative, the rather that there were over two hundred professors of history keeping the ancient record of Ireland, and every one of them having a subsidy from the nobles of Ireland on that account, and having the revision of the nobility and clergy from time to time. Because of its antiquity, likewise, it is the more worthy of trust, and, also, that it has not suffered interruption or suppression from the violence of strangers. For, notwithstanding that the Norsemen had been troubling Ireland for a period, there were such a number of learned men keeping the ancient record that the historical compilation was preserved, even though many books fell into the hands of the Norsemen. Howbeit, it is not thus with other European countries, because the Romans, Gauls, Goths, Vandals, Saxons, Saracens, Moors, and Danes destroyed their old records in every inroad (of their kings) which they made upon them: yet, it fell not to any of these to plunder Ireland, according to Cambrensis, in the forty-sixth chapter, where he says, speaking of Ireland: 'Ireland was, from the beginning, free from incursion of any foreign nation.' From this it may be understood that Ireland was free from the invasion of enemies by which her ancient history and her former transactions would be extinguished; and it is not so with any other country in Europe. Wherefore I think that it is more fitting to rely on the history of Ireland than on the history of any other country in Europe, and, moreover, as it has been expurgated by Patrick, and by the holy clergy of Ireland, from time to time." (Ibid, p. 77.)

The pages of Keating are constantly diversified by quaint verses, sententious and compact, quoted from very old poems. He forestalls the objection that they might arouse by insisting on their antiquity, and on the official character they acquired through the public revision of these ancient narratives that took place triennially at Tara. Once locked in metrical forms, it was harder to tamper

with their content. In addition, the versified stories were easier to retain, and as a rule, they had the charm of archaic words and phrases that acted like miniatures or echoes of the remote past. The Four Masters, too, abound in these quatrains and place in them an absolute confidence. The "Four Ancient Books of Wales" present an image of what such metrical chronicles looked like; similarly, the curious old Irish poem on "The Voyage of Brann, the Son of Febal," edited by Kuno Meyer.

"If any one should charge it upon me as a strange thing wherefore I give many verses as evidence for the history out of the old record, my answer to him is that my reason for that is, that the authors of the ancient record framed the entire historical compilation in poems, in order that thereby the less change should be made in the record; and also, that in this manner, it might the more be committed to memory by the students who were attending them: for it is through being verse metre the 'saltair' of Tara was called to the chief book which was in the custody of the king of Ireland's own professors, and the 'saltair' of Cashel to the chronicle of Cormac, son of Cuileannan, and the 'saltair' of the verses to the record of Aonghus the 'culdee:' for, as 'psalm' and 'duan' (poem) or 'dan' (song) are alike, equal are 'saltair' or 'psalterium' and 'duanaire' in which there would be many poems or songs: and forasmuch as in the poems are the bone and marrow of the ancient record, I think that it is expedient for me to rely on it as authority in treating of the history. Therefore, I have often said, in opposing the authors who have been refuted by us, that the ancient record was against them, because I considered that the record which was common and had been frequently revised, has more of authority, as we have said, than any one solitary author of those who are in the history." (Ibid, p. 91.)

IV.

Keating was by no means an exceptional scholarly figure among the Irish of the first part of the seventeenth century. Indeed, some of his contemporaries rather underrate the writer's abilities.[19] The

[19] Fr. Turner, parish priest of Wexford, writing in 1631 to Luke Wadding at Rome, says:: "One Father Keating laboreth much, as I hear say, in compiling Irish notes towards a history in Irish. Ye man is very studious, and yet I fear if his worke ever come to light, it will need an amendment of ill-warranted narrations. He could help you to many curiosities of which you can make better use than himself. I have no interest in ye man, for he dwelleth in Mounster." Meehan, op. cit., p. 306.

"Colgan and Keating, both of them Irish priests, have been unmercifully dealt with by our writers of the last two hundred years, on the very unfounded assumption that both these truly learned men believed themselves everything which appears in their writings. This can scarcely be called a fair proceeding, when we remember that Keating never professed to do more than abstract without comment what he found before him in the old books; and that Colgan had not promised or undertaken to give a critically digested History of the Lives of the Irish Saints at all. In fact, Colgan, like Keating, simply undertook to publish through the more accessible medium of the Latin language, the ancient lives just as he found them in the Gaedhlic. And it would be more becoming those who have drawn largely and often exclusively on the writings of these two eminent men, and who will continue to draw on them, to endeavor to imitate their devoted industry and scholarship, than to attempt to elevate themselves to a higher position of literary fame by a display of critical pedanty and what they suppose to be independence of opinion, in scoffing at the presumed credulity of those whose labors have laid in modern times the very groundwork of Irish history. O'Curry, op. cit., p. 341.

names of Luke Wadding, Michael O'Clery, Patrick Fleming, Hugh Ward, Bonaventure Baron, Thomas Messingham, come before us as representatives of that laborious historical research which necessarily precedes all critical narrative or philosophical exposition of the facts of history. Indefatigable collectors of historical materials were the Franciscans, habitual chroniclers of many chieftains and ancient houses. Fr. Meehan has admirably paraphrased their spirit and their method in the account he gives of the accurate and pathetic description made in 1608 by Fr. Mooney of the status of the principal Franciscan establishments then flourishing in Ireland.

The literary glories of the whole order were very dear to its Irish members, since Luke Wadding found time, amid his many distracting occupations, to compile the classical "Annals of the Friars Minor" in eight large folios, a yet indispensable work to the general historian.[20] At the same time Fr. Michael O'Clery was travelling through Ireland from one monastic house to another, collecting for Fr. Hugh Ward at Louvain the materials for a complete collection of the lives of the Irish Saints.[21] His work was carried on "amid the ever-thickening political shocks of that most destructive age." His excellent transcripts of old sources were regularly remitted to Hugh Ward (Mac an Bháird) but the latter died before he could begin the "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae" that he had planned. O'Clery was a trained antiquary before he joined the Franciscans; he belonged to a family of traditional historians, and so was well equipped to recognize the value of all the manuscripts that passed under his eyes, whether ecclesiastical or secular, prose or poetical. Almost as a recreation he compiled from them two works known as the Réim Rioghraidhe or "Succession of Kings in Ireland" and the Leabhar Gabhala or "Book of Invasions." The former brings down to 1022 the genealogy of the Irish Kings from the earliest times; the latter gives an account of the colonizations of Ireland down to

---

[20] Annales Minorum, seu trium Ordinum a Sancto Francesco institutorum auctore A. R. P. Luca Wadingo Hiberno, Sacrae Theologiae Jubilato Lectore et Ordinis Chronologo. Lugduni, 7 vols. fol. 1625-1648. An eighth volume was printed at Rome in 1654. A second edition was begun at Rome in sixteen folio volumes in 1731, and continued at various intervals. The twenty-fifth folio volume was printed at Quaracchi in 1887. Fr. Francis Harold, author of a life of Fr. Wadding, published in Latin some excerpts of the work, (Rome, 2 vols., fol. 1662). Fr. Marcellino da Civezza, the illustrious historian of the Franciscan missions, calls Wadding "una figura gigantesca nell' ordine sotto ogni rispetto e pochi sono che lo conoscano." *Bibliografia Sanfrancescana.* Prato, 1879, p. 640.

[21] Cf. Irish Theologians of the Seventeenth Century, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (III. Series), I., 277-286, and de Buck, L'Archéologie Irlandaise au Couvent de St. Antoine de Padoue à Louvain. Paris, 1869. See Bellesheim, Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Irland, III., 686, sqq., and Hurter's Nomenclator, passim.

the same period. The material was entirely taken from the ancient books, many of them now lost, and conveniently arranged by the skilful hand of O'Clery. These labors helped still more to fit him for the task of "The Annals of Donegal" (Four Masters) that he completed between 1632 and 1634 with the aid of several antiquaries of his own family and at the expense of the high minded chieftain, Fergal O'Gara, Lord of Moy Gara and Coolavin. O'Clery is also the author of the famous work known as the "Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae" or Martyrology of Donegal. (Dublin, 1864.) Three attempts were made in the nineteenth century to print in their entirety the Annals of the Four Masters. The third publication bears the name of John O'Donovan as editor, and is rightly said to be the greatest work ever accomplished by any modern Irish scholar.[22]

John Colgan took up the task that Michael O'Clery had collected for so zealously, and out of the materials that his friend had gathered began the "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae." It never went beyond the first volume.[23] It was soon followed, however, by the famous collection of documents concerning Saints Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille.[24] Colgan wrote also a life of his countryman Duns Scotus.[25]

[22] "As if to emphasize the truth that they were only redacting the Annals of Ireland from the most ancient sources at their command, the Masters wrote in an ancient bardic dialect full at once of such idioms and words as were unintelligible even to the men of their own day, unless they had received a bardic training. In fact they were learned men writing for the learned, and this work was one of the last efforts of the *esprit de corps* of the school-bred shanachy, which always prompted him to keep bardic and historical learning a close monopoly amongst his own class. Keating was Michael O'Clery's contemporary, but he wrote—and I consider him the first Irish historian and chronicler who did so—for the masses and not for the classes, and he had his reward in the thousands of copies of his popular History, made and read throughout all Ireland, while the copies made of the Annals were quite few in comparison, and after the end of the seventeenth century little read." Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 580.

On the curious discipline of the "Bardic Schools" that continued to exist in Ireland throughout the seventeenth century, see ibid, pp. 524-530.

[23] Acta Sanctorum veteris et majoris Scotiae seu Hiberniae, Lovanii, 1645. The value of some of these old vellums transcribed by O'Clery may be learned from the important texts made known in the Codex Salmanticensis, Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae ex Codice Salmanticensi nunc primum integre, edit. C. de Smedt, Bruxelles, 4o, 1888. The Bollandist editors rightly call it "haud spernendum illud antiqui musaei Bollandiani cimelium."

[24] Trias Thaumaturga, seu divorum Patricii, Columbae et Brigidae, trium Hiberniae sanctorum insulae communium patronorum Acta, Lovanii, 1647, in two enormous folios. The work is still very valuable, and as rare as it is useful.

[25] Tractatus de patria, vita, scriptis Johannis Scoti Doctoris Sublimis." A copy of this rare work is in the Franciscan Monastery at Dublin. He left, moreover, nearly 3,000 manuscript pages, dealing with the lives and history of Irish saints and monks in England, Brittany, Gaul, Belgium, Lorraine, Burgundy, the Rhineland and Italy. These priceless hagiographical treasures have been almost entirely lost. Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 577.

To the contemporary of Colgan, and his fellow-Franciscan, Fr. Patrick Fleming, we owe a work still in constant use by the historians of Ireland, political, ecclesiastical, and literary.[26] Patrick Fleming was a near relative, and a disciple of Thomas Fleming, son to the sixteenth baron of Slane, a family of the English Pale, that, with one exception, ever deserved well of the Irish Church. (Meehan op. cit. pp. 144-145). Our author was made guardian of the Irish Franciscan convent at Prague in 1631, and in the same year was murdered with the deacon Matthew Hoar at Beneschow in Bohemia by Calvinist peasants. In the same field of Irish hagiology worked Thomas Messingham, Rector of the Irish College in Paris. His work is still of service.[27] Messingham was in literary communication with the scholarly David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory, and Luke Wadding (Meehan, op. cit. p. 355). About the same time Fr. Henry Fitzsimons, S. J., had published an alphabetical catalogue of the principal saints of Ireland, with the sources of his information.[28] In this work, Fitzsimon makes use of the "Kalendarium" prepared by his fellow Jesuit, the learned Richard Fleming (1596), and the "Collectanea" of another learned Jesuit, Fr. Stephen White. From the "Kalendarium" was composed a Litany of Irish Saints that the exiled earls at Rome were wont to recite every day at a fixed hour in company with Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh. This distinguished divine was himself the author of a valuable work on Irish history.[29] Lately an unedited work of the same writer was discovered by the indefatigable Sir John Gilbert. It is dedicated to James I.[30]

One of the most personal and interesting histories of the seventeenth century is the Latin work already quoted, in which the son of Donal O'Sullivan Beare, Chief of Dunboy, has related the vicissitudes of the ill-starred rebellion of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone,

[26] Collectanea Sacra, seu S. Columbae et aliorum sanctorum Acta et Opuscula, Lovanii, 1667.

[27] Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum, seu Vitae et Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae, Paris, 1624, in folio.

[28] Catalogus praecipuorum sanctorum Hiberniae, recognitus et auctus per R. P. Henricum Fitzsimons, S. J., Duaci, 1615, Leodii, 1619; and nine times after that: cf. Henry Fitzsimons, S. J., Catholic Confutation to Mr. Rider's Claim to Antiquitie, Rouen, 1868. Britannomachia Ministrorum, Duaci, 1614: Words of Comfort to Persecuted Catholics, written in Exile, 1607: Letters from a Cell in Dublin Castle, edited by Edm. Hogan, S. J., Dublin, 1881.

[29] De Regno Hiberniae sanctorum insula commentarius, 4o, Lovanii, 1632, reprinted with prefatory memoir by Cardinal Moran, Dublin, 1868, from the original (Barberini) MS. at Rome.

[30] Ad Jacobum I., Magnae Britanniae Franciae et Hiberniae Regem Maximum Basilicon Doron a Petro Lombard Archiepiscopo Armacano destinatum ac dictatum pro religione et patria. This was in imitation, no doubt, of a famous similarly titled work of that king.

that ended with the defeat of Kinsale (1601) and the thrilling siege of Dunboy (1602) where of the one hundred and forty-three defenders "no one man escaped," says Sir George Carew, "but were either slain, executed, or buried in the ruins; and so obstinate and resolved a defense had not been seene within this kingdom."

The contemporary Irish episcopate was both learned and sympathetic to learning. In the midst of unspeakable trials, the Franciscan Thomas Fleming, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin (1623-1651) found time to encourage the historians of his native land.

"Passionately fond of the ancient literature of Ireland," says Fr. Meehan (op. cit., p. 147), "he generously entertained brother Michael O'Clery in the Convent of Dublin, and it was under that poor roof that the chief of the Four Masters found bed and board while transcribing a goodly portion of the material which was subsequently incorporated in the "Annals of Donegal." To his brethren in Louvain, he extended the same patronage, and it is to his fostering care we are indebted for Colgan's "Trias Thaumaturga," a fact gratefully acknowledge by the author (ib., p. 316) who states that the archbishop transmitted to him many a rare book and valuable record without which he could not have completed his noble work. These surely are evidences of an intellectual nobility which, in that transition period strove to maintain the honor of Ireland by preserving and perpetuating its ancient literature."

Cornelius O'Deveney, bishop of Down and Conor, cruelly martyred at Dublin in 1611 by the flinty Chichester, had been collecting for several years the records of the Irish bishops, clergy and laymen, whom Elizabeth had outlawed, exiled, or executed, for refusing the oath of supremacy. These fragmentary notices came into the hands of a man who was made for better times, fitted to be a genuine Maecenas of learning, and himself no mean scholar—David Rothe, born in 1573, bishop of Ossory from 1618 to 1650. This truly noble Irish ecclesiastic labored for many years at an antiquarian treatise entitled "Hierographia Sacra Hiberniae." It was a general ecclesiastical survey of Ireland, commencing with the history of Kilkenny and comprising notices of Irish saints, cathedrals, shrines, dioceses, places of pilgrimage, anchorets, early seats of learning, holy wells, rural deaneries—in a word a series of essays on Irish archæology, the great value of which is apparent from the few fragments that have been preserved by transcription. He also labored for fifty years at an Ecclesiastical History of Ireland from the earliest days to his own time. It is a great pity that these learned works, particularly the latter, though both ready for the press, should have been carried off or destroyed by the Cromwellian savages in the sack of Kilkenny (1650).

The notes of Bishop O'Deveney must have been seen through the press by Rothe before 1617, for in that year a second enlarged and annotated edition in three parts was printed—the whole bearing the title "Analecta," and signed by T. W. Philadelphus.[31] This en-

[31] Rothe, Analecta, edited with an introduction by (Cardinal) Patrick F. Moran, Dublin, 1884.

larged edition of the "Index Martyrialis" is an admirable summary of fifty years of martyrdom in the Irish Church, and bears on every page an impress of the calm gravity and stern decision that characterized so many superior souls in that dread time. It is great indeed for a nation to know how to live, but how few nations know how to die! To this work Rothe added an appendix entitled "Diasphendon Hiberniae" or Dismemberment of Ireland, in reference to the two acts of parliament on the oath of supremacy and liturgical conformity. In 1620 there was printed at Paris a Latin rendering of a sermon of Rothe on St. Brigid which he had preached in that city in 1617 at the Irish College, being strongly urged thereto by a wealthy citizen and benefactor named Escalopier. It urges the students to make ready for martyrdom, and criticises severely Thomas Dempster, who had just undertaken to strip Ireland of her title of Island of Saints in favor of Scotland. In 1621, Rothe published at Rouen and Cologne, under the pseudonym of Donatus Roirk, a work entitled "Hibernia Resurgens" or "Preservation against the Bite of the Old Serpent." He rejects and exposes again the fallacies and plagiarisms of the fantastic Scotsman. Rothe also defended his "Analecta" against the hypocritical contentions of Sir Thomas Ryves and of Harris (Writers of Ireland) that the victims of Elizabeth and James were guilty of high treason and punished as such. This apology has been lost with the other writings of Rothe. He was a correspondent in matters of erudition with Ussher, who borrowed from him certain very old and valuable documents for his "Sylloge Epistolarum," not without acknowledging that they had been communicated to him by Rothe, "a most diligent investigator of his country's antiquities." Another work, "Samaritanus Praescribens Remedia Hiberniae," destined to reconcile the conflicting parties in the Assembly of Kilkenny was never printed, and has probably perished with so many of his writings.

Hugh O'Reilly (1580-1652) successively bishop of Kilmore and archbishop of Armagh, fully justified his princely origin by the encouragement he gave to Colgan in the publication of his "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae." Out of his scant revenues, he furnished the means for the publication of the work, and deserved to see his name on the title-page.

"May we not imagine," says Fr. Meehan (p. 169), "with what complacency he perused those pages in which Colgan so elegantly alludes to his princely origin; the renown of his ancestors in ancient times; their prowess in the battlefield; their munificence to church and cloister; his own promotion to the see of Kilmore; his elevation to the primacy, and the hereditary valour of his kinsmen, who, worthy of their sires, were then in arms for their religion, king, and fatherland, a patent of intellectual nobility which no monarch could confer!"

It is to O'Reilly's credit that he tried, but without success, to

have the Gregorian calendar adopted in Ireland. He was the heart and soul of the confederation of Kilkenny. His kinsman, Owen O'Neill, was the general who, properly supported, might have won at least better terms for Ireland than were the wretched outcome of once bright hopes. During the war, his relative, Malmorra the Slasher, was slain near Granard. The clansmen carried him to Cavan, to the old Franciscan convent, and there raised a monument bearing these words at once sad and proud:

> Lector, ne credas solum periisse Milonem,
> Ecce nam sub tumulo patria victa jacet.

These were not the only learned Irish bishops of that day. Nicholas French, bishop of Ferns, wrote a work on the Irish history of his own times.[32] Thomas Dease (1568-1651), bishop of Meath, descendant of an ancient and wealthy family, was a good poet in the Irish tongue, and a master of classical literature. Like most Irishmen of the time, he had received his education abroad, but not before imbibing much learning from the ancestral sources.[33] Occasionally, as in the case of Hugh MacCaghwell, Archbishop of Armagh, who died at Rome in 1626, they received an early education in the Isle of Man, with which the Irish at all times kept up close and friendly communication.[34]

The figure of Peter Lombard (1554-1625) archbishop of Armagh since 1601, is one of the most attractive in the Roman Curia of the early part of the seventeenth century. Lombard was, in his time, the most brilliant of the young Irish students at Louvain, where he attracted the attention of the Holy See as a "youth of great promise." He lived at Rome under five Popes, and took a lively part in the labors of the famous Congregation, "De Auxiliis," called to settle

[32] The Bleeding Iphigenia, or Sale and Settlement of Ireland, 1649. Cf. The Historical Works of Nicholas French, now for the first time collected, vol. I., Settlement of Ireland; vol. II., The Unkind Deserter, Dublin, 1840.

[33] Cf. Meehan, The Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries and Memoirs of the Irish Hierarchy in the seventeenth century, with appendix containing numerous original documents, Dublin, 1872.

[34] Hugh MacCaghwell was born at Saul, county of Down, about the year 1571. His parents were poor, but, their poverty notwithstanding, they did all in their power to advance his early education, and when the boy grew up he went to the Isle of Man, and remained there many years, devoting himself to the study of classics and dialectics till he was recalled to Ireland by Hugh, prince of Tyrone, and who took him into his household, and appointed him tutor to his sons Henry and Hugh." Meehan, op. cit., p. 157. MacCaghwell became a Franciscan at Salamanca, lector on theology at that university, and later one of the original founders of St. Anthony's College at Louvain, and at Rome of St. Isidore's, likewise for brethren of his order. With Luke Wadding he obtained from Urban VIII. the approval of an Irish College at Rome for diocesan priests, and from Cardinal Ludovisi the funds for the building and endowment. MacCaghwell was a valiant Scotist. Besides many volumes of theology he wrote (1620) a Life of Scotus.

certain theological questions at issue between the Jesuits and the Dominicans. Though Lombard never returned to Ireland as archbishop of Armagh, he served his country well as the Roman agent of Tyrone. He has left us the above-mentioned important history of the affairs of Ireland in his own time. It deals especially with the vicissitudes of the great Northern earls. It was looked upon by the English as a "dangerous book," and its sale and circulation suppressed.

Scarcely less distinguished than Peter Lombard was his contemporary, the Franciscan Florence O'Conry (Flathry O'Moelchonery). Disciple of Baius at Louvain and friend of Jansenius, he had arrived at the theological conclusions of the latter by an independent study of the writings of St. Augustine. His own writings were highly esteemed by the Jansenists.[35]

The family of St. Dominic was never without superior and scholarly representatives in Ireland.[36] Roche MacGeoghegan (1580-1640) was educated at Lisbon and Salamanca, and held the see of Kildare from 1629 to 1640. He had collected a vast library, but was obliged to pledge a great portion of it to relieve his suffering flock. MacGeoghegan died at Kilbeggan, whither he had gone to consult the famous physician, Owen O'Shiel, the "Eagle of Irish Doctors."[37]

---

[35] Peregrinus Jerichontinus, Paris, 1641, with an introduction and dedication to Urban VIII., who had consecrated O'Conry. O'Conry published also an Irish Catechism at Louvain in 1625 under the title "Mirror of a Christian Life." This Catechism, like that of O'Hussey (Louvain, 1608) and Stapleton (Brussels, 1639) and some others was meant for the benefit of the Irish troops serving in the Netherlands. What such troopers were like may be seen from the curious drawing of Albert Durer. "Albert Durer had seen the Irish soldiers in the Low Countries and he drew a sketch of five of them which is still preserved at Vienna. They are fine, powerfully built, and formidable looking fellows, armed with the long sword and the gallowglass axe, clad in a mantle of Irish rug, and wearing the Irish glib and moustache, which it was forbidden to wear at home under pain of forfeiture, not only of the glib and moustache, but even of the head. The great artist wrote over the drawing: "Here go the war-men of Ireland!" Hogan's Distinguished Irishmen of the Seventeenth Century, pp. 115-116. The poet Spenser could not but voice the universal opinion of the bravery of the Irish soldiers in foreign service. "I have heard some great warriors say that in all the services they had seen abroad they never saw a more comely man than the Irishman, nor that cometh on more bravely in his charge." Op. cit., p. 416.

[36] Cf. Thomas de Burgo, *Hibernia Dominicana*, Co loniae, 1762.

[37] On the skill of contemporary Irish physicians in general, and in particular O'Shiel cf. the curious and interesting summary of an ancient manuscript memoir in Fr. Meehan, op. cit., pp. 373-390. At the same time, Neal O'Glacan, a native of Donegal, was professor of medicine successively in the Universities of Toulouse and Bologna, and afterwards physician to the King of France. To the same period belongs Bernard O'Conor, the physician of John Sobieski at the siege of Vienna (1683) and afterwards professor of medicine at Oxford. Cf. Dictionary of National Biography s. v.

The traditional genius of Ireland was therefore recognized in continental Europe throughout the seventeenth century. In theology, philosophy, history, administration, the arts of peace and war, the unhappy exiles won renown—beside the few whose names are famous we must imagine a nameless multitude whose modesty or circumstances forbade the transmission of their learning to posterity. The literary histories of the great religious orders, and of Belgium, Spain and France, are rich with the records of such lives consumed in study and teaching.

For this reason it is all the more to be regretted that so ardent and studious a race should have been compelled to quit its immemorial stronghold and seek abroad the larger learning it was denied at home. Ireland might well have had many and superior Keatings. By traditions and temperament she was called to furnish pioneers in the science of history, writers who would have enriched the native tongue with the best thought of other lands, while affording it new fields of exercise and multitudinous points of contact with all the new forces then disengaging themselves from the mediæval past to mould the future of humanity. The land, small and everywhere accessible, was itself a rare mirror of the past, pagan and Christian. Its numerous monuments of architecture were both peculiar and instructive, and sheltered a multitude of historical materials—church plate and furnishings, reliquaries, relics, sepulchres, inscriptions.

On all sides were families devoted to special branches of learning and jealous to preserve the oldest records of the same. Each chieftain had a living interest in, a daily need of, the local genealogies, with which went habitually the memories of the past, local reminiscences and local coloring in which events and institutions are enshrined as flies in ambergris. The spoken tongue of the people was itself a venerable museum of history, replete with intelligence and explanation of the past. Manuscripts abounded, some of them almost coeval with the conversion of the race.

It was a period of transition, and the new learning that had conquered its right to existence on the Continent might well have furnished the Irish genius a very suitable field for its bent toward literary erudition and the veneration of the manners and monuments of the past. Some of the best gifts of the historian were native to the Irish scribe or investigator—extensive research, exact intelligence, candor of speech. In the mediæval universities the Irish had long enjoyed their full share of glory—one of the two great schools of rational theology was called the Irish (Scotist) school. The native fondness for mathematics and chronology might well have led the way to critical and exact research—what the native schools could produce in the way of erudite toil was shown in the persons of

Luke Wadding and John Colgan. Indeed, it would seem that in the ordinary course of Divine Providence the Irish Franciscans were called to create a domestic school of history no less famous than the Benedictine school in contemporary seventeenth century France.

It is at once pathetic and significant that the last national historians of Gaelic Ireland should have written in the native tongue—one in the select academic speech of scholars, the other in the every-day language of the people, one in an interminable voluminous record enshrining the chief traits of a national life that was fast ebbing, the other in a compendium destined to bear across the eighteenth century a popular conception of the past of Ireland that might be incorrect in details, but was otherwise portraitesque in its veracity. Keating, in particular, rendered the Irish people a service for which they can never be grateful enough—he placed in their hands a résumé of the past at once clear, brief, lively, intelligible. What the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle did for the English consciousness his history did for the Irish. He was more to his people than Geoffrey of Monmouth or Henry of Huntingdon or Florence of Worcester had ever been to England, for these monastic chroniclers wrote in the lettered ease of cloisters, while the persecuted Irish cleric wrote his story amid alarms and flights and wanderings—a circumstance that endeared to every reader this catechism of the Irish past and raised it to the dignity of a Book of Martyrs. Soon the night of penal legislation falls upon a people that had already borne more than a century of intermittent conflict. No longer does a stronghold of O'Neill or O'Donnell welcome the historian and his parchments; only the traveling harper and the Jacobite bard continue to nourish the fires of patriotism with impassioned music and symbolic songs. The hospitable hearths of ancient abbeys are quenched and their storied and painted vellums scattered or destroyed. With Julian malice and more than Julian fortune a Time of Ignorance was created for the "Island of Saints and Schoolmasters"—the dreary intellectual horror of the eighteenth century. That the doomed race did not utterly forget the rock from which it was hewn, nor the hole of the pit from whence it was dug, was certainly owing to the wide diffusion of Keating's masterly book. Its very defects, as we moderns reckon, were its chief qualities in the eyes of men who had accepted a philosophy of calm despair, and found their only relief in the romantic contemplation of a glorious past, sole remnant of an immemorial independence, pride and greatness.

Thomas J. Shahan.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

THE POPULAR PLAY.

THE task of presenting an accurate picture of present dramatic conditions is neither easy nor inviting. Precise data cannot be found easily, and prejudice against the stage is as active as it is inconsistent and ill-informed. Whether one treats the subject as a popular amusement, somewhat regulated by law, and very much regulated by public opinion; or discusses it as a branch of the literary art; or approaches it from the purely commercial and utilitarian side: there is sure to be misunderstanding unless the writer's tone be one of disparagement. Thirty years ago the misinformed denounced the novel pretty much as they denounce the stage to-day. The novel and the stage survive, and have increased in influence, not because the denunciations of the fathers lacked something of justification, but because both stage and novel are social and literary facts that have been from the beginning and will be to the end. Denunciation should be directed at the abuses of power, and not at the power itself, unless it also be evil.

Official opinion of the stage is curiously at variance with popular and individual sentiment. There is a class of ministers who make it part of their regular duty to criticize the passing show. Their criticism, usually adverse, and directed at the particular drama just then amusing naughty audiences, has for principle: from one learn all. Occasionally the more loose-tongued of this class laud the stage to the skies, and pronounce its general influence superior to that of the Protestant pulpit. In Catholic journals the stage is almost ignored, or coldly mentioned in passing criticism; while editorially the tone is always denunciatory. The more remote the journal from the city the more bitter the denunciation is likely to prove. The non-Catholic clergy as a body cherish a distrust of the stage, are quite convinced of its traditional depravity, and detest it perhaps even more than they detest the saloon. Our priesthood is a divided body on the question, with an official majority, however, against the stage. The professional critics of the drama, strangely enough, are not always its friends, and hedge in their favor with so thick a briar that one may count them on either side. On the whole it may safely be said that distrust of the stage is a commoner sentiment with our natural and official heads than any other. They respect the ban which many traditions in as many countries long ago put upon the stage and the player.

On the other hand no fact stands out more clearly in our day than the popularity of the stage and the player from every point of view. With the multitude the player is now a person of distinction, and

even the children gather about the stage-door after a matinee to see their hero in the familiar light of day. The theatres are multiplying in the larger cities, capital has been attracted to the investment of amusing the people, and the road companies, the old-time barn-stormers, are meeting with greater encouragement every year. The successful dramatist easily makes a fortune. Very often we hear the story of the popular novelist deserting the novel for the lighter and better-paid work of the dramatist. Oftener still we see the stage-hater converted into the inveterate playgoer. It would be difficult to name a popular amusement which brings more patrons to its halls, more profit to its promoters, and greater honor to its actors and playwrights. It may be said of Catholics in this country that, as a body, they have a high regard for the stage. Actors themselves recognize this trait in them. A few Catholic journals have therefore ventured to discuss the stage regularly and to give a brief chronicle of the passing play, a thing which so great a journal as *Le Correspondant* of Paris has been doing for the last twenty years. Nevertheless, side by side with this popular patronage of the stage runs the official distrust and denunciation.

This difference between the utterances of authority and the conduct of the crowd has not yet been explained, but may easily be accounted for, since it springs from a confusion of ideas. "The stage" is a phrase that covers large ground, and embraces many things beside the drama, which has now become only a single department in the grand scheme of public entertainment. On the stage are produced grand opera, comic and light opera, spectacle, musical farce, the so-called farce-comedy, and vaudeville. These forms of entertainment belong to "the stage," but they are not the drama. However closely they may imitate the play, they are not plays. With the exception of grand opera these forms of amusement are flexible, admit of anything in the shape of diversion from a stereopticon lecture on Spain to a dog circus, and serve easily as a vehicle for whatever will suit the taste of an audience. They may be clean or obscene, nice or vulgar, coarse or refined. All depends upon the manager, custom allows them a wide margin with regard to the etiquette of morality, and audiences are usually indifferent to the moral worth of their actors. A minister sees one of these entertainments, and at once delivers a denunciation of the stage in general; a clean soul gapes horrified at the vulgarity of a musical farce, or farce-comedy, and ever after looks upon the stage with disgust. On the other hand the better class of stage entertainments and the regular drama are on the whole decent and sober in presentation, and attract rather than repel their patrons, who are pleased and edified beyond expectation. They see and hear nothing

worthy of condemnation, and the clean play becomes a part of their regular recreation.

In other words the stage is one thing and the drama another. The two have been confused, and included in the same denunciation. The stage entertainment outside the drama is a commercial affair like the circus, not a matter of literature and art; a mixture of the good and the bad like the saloon, the popular picnic-ground, or the seaside resort. One must exercise ordinary discretion in selecting his stage entertainment as in other things. The drama is the original stage entertainment, coeval with man, I must believe, in spite of the records, or the lack of them; since it is as natural for man to act a story as to tell it. The play tells a story, and in our day hangs the story upon the peg of a love-theme. This is a convention so absolute that no dramatist can dispense with it, unless he is willing to dispense, like Ibsen, with audiences. The convention is no hardship. There is not such a surplus of true love on earth as to make its conventional and necessary presence a hindrance to a play. On the other hand the stage entertainment has few conventions, its chief duty and necessity being to amuse the audience at any cost. Therefore the grand opera occasionally descends to ballet spectacle, the comic opera may present a vaudeville performance or a mock circus between its legitimate sections, and the other forms of entertainment endeavor to surprise with novelties most incongruous.

These details make clear and pertinent the fact that the stage and the drama are not the same thing, and that wholesale and sweeping denunciation does not exactly fit the circumstances. The experienced audience understands very well the gaps in the information supplied to the average denouncer; the experienced reader can measure to a fraction the ignorance of the editor who on occasions shakes his rhetorical fist at the latest news of the stage. I have before me at the present moment a list of entertainments at the forty-two theatres of New York city for the last week of February this year. They diverted their patrons with one grand opera, four burlesques, seven vaudeville shows, ten comic-operas so-called, and twenty dramas. The critics and reviewers are authority for the statement that all but one of the vaudeville shows were clean in fact and intention, that the comic operas and the burlesques were too inane for the most part to be more than vulgar or commonplace, that fifteen of the dramas were beyond reproach, four were morally clean but not to be witnessed by children, and one was somewhat nasty in intention, though not so in expression. This is certainly a favorable analysis, though it must be remembered that the critics are metropolitan. The judgment of the rural moralists might be

more severe, for the reason that New Yorkers have grown used to certain conventionalities of the stage, which shock the inexperienced by their suggestiveness. In the city they no longer have any meaning; in the country they look as audacious as the Apollo Belvedere in a district schoolhouse. Nevertheless with due allowance for the degrees of sensitiveness in the urban and rural populations, the absence of dirt and offensiveness in thirty-two out of forty-two entertainments is worthy of note; and the percentage of cleanness is large enough to demand a finer discrimination in the common denunciation of the stage.

However, this article is not concerned with the stage, but with the drama; and with that form of it indicated by the title, the popular play, as opposed to the productions of Ibsen and other experimentalists; and again with the English-speaking stage and the present time, which includes the nineteenth century. These limitations are necessary both by the nature of the subject, and by the necessity of defense against the slap-dash editor, the hasty reader, the moral critic, and the pious souls, to whom the very mention of the drama is offensive and even sinful. I am not defending the stage, nor that department of it devoted to the drama. The intention is merely to place before readers some facts once known but long forgotten, with others that have been overlooked; in order to secure at least a suspension of judgment, and a re-examination of an untenable position. In many things our methods do not compare favorably with the striking methods of our fathers in dealing with the questions of the hour. Thus, in the history of modern drama we are told that St. Gregory Nazianzen banished immoral plays from the theatre and staged his own compositions on the lives of the saints and the martyrs; that these sacred dramas were introduced into the convents and monasteries of the East, and later of the West; that ecclesiastics were the actors, and that a layman would as soon thought of saying Mass as of taking a part in these dramas. As we all know these sacred plays led in England to the public miracle play, which was the source of the modern melodrama. The straightforward manner of dealing with a problem in the days of St. Gregory accounts perhaps for the success of Christianity on the human side in those perilous times, when a priest was as ready to play the martyr in a sacred drama, for the pious entertainment of the people, as to face the beasts in the arena or starvation in the desert.

The aim of the modern play is to present a story of human life as nearly like the real thing as possible. With well-trained actors, who can disguise themselves perfectly with the assumed character, and with a stage whose mechanical powers enable it to produce the most

marvelous illusions, the modern playwright finds it easy to impress his audience properly. It is a fact to be taken into account, in measuring the influence of the modern drama, that the average playgoer surrenders himself entirely to the illusion produced by a well-managed stage. The critics, the first-nighters, and the habitués of the theatre have lost this power of self-surrender. They enjoy no illusion. Their pleasure springs from study of the actors and the play, and a comparison of actors and playwright with themselves or rivals in the same domain. This fact will explain one phenomenon in dramatic affairs: the unexpected popularity of a play which the critics to a man have condemned. The critics take one standpoint, and the public takes another. A popular play is a valuable piece of property, but its value largely depends on its power to please audiences as far apart as Montreal and New Orleans. It must travel far and long, and face very different audiences. Therefore the effort to make it universally pleasing is very great. Whether it be high or low comedy, melodrama for Broadway or the cheaper theatres, tragedy of the finer or coarser fibre, it must be written for the varied American audience.

These facts are mentioned because they have added much to the rigidity of stage conventions. These conventions of the drama are formalities to be observed by every dramatist in building up a play. Without them no play can secure presentation. The love-theme, for example, is the most absolute convention of the modern stage. A tendency to greater strictness in observing these conventions has come with the increased chances of financial success. Playwrights complain in consequence, but the managers are obdurate, and will rarely attempt innovations. A study of the more important of these conventions is now in order, and will prove very instructive. They may be summed up in the general statement that the popular play cannot offend the first principles of Christian faith and Christian morality. In order to get at the precise significance of this statement it will be necessary to go into details. In the first place playgoers know that the average play is usually concerned with the triumph of justice and right over their opposites. The hero and heroine after a struggle against odds win peace, wealth, and honor by overcoming the villain, and then get married. Love, sacrifice, and the triumph of virtue are the conventional themes of the popular play, and no dramatist can work without them. Pessimistic realism so far has failed to get a footing in the play. The triumph of the right is the chief convention of the popular play.

The second presupposes the existence and the providence of God. No dramatist in America or England could secure presentation for a drama that denied the existence and providence of God, or implied

a general disbelief in these doctrines. The play must be built upon lines that will not contravene them; and the oftener they are used for the critical and emotional moments of the drama the more pleased will be the average audience. The richest lines to an actor, the most effective with his hearers, are those which call upon the Deity to interfere in behalf of the oppressed, and to crush the oppressor; or which leave to God the care of the wronged and the avenging of their injuries. A curious example of this convention was provided recently in a melodrama built out of three popular poems of John Hay, the present Secretary of State, and entitled *Jim Bludso.* The leading character was an engineer on the Mississippi, who held the bow of a burning steamer against the bank of the river while the passengers got ashore. His bravery cost him his life. Jim is represented as a typical citizen of Pike county, Missouri, with no religion and few beliefs beyond that of God's existence. In His providence he does not believe, on the ground that man is too small a creature for the Infinite to notice; a heresy sharply rebuked by the minister in the play. The time will come, says the minister, when affliction will make clear to you that God must help us in miseries beyond the power of man to soothe or remove; then you will get on your knees willing enough, and with faith enough in God's goodness to win the answer to your prayer. The playwright contrives that such a moment shall come for Jim. The overflowing river carries away his wife, his boy, and his faithful servant, and the villain has a rope about Jim's neck ready for his hanging; it is a desperate moment, and Jim falls on his knees confessing the need of God's help and his faith in the Divine interference; in answer to his prayer for the safety of his boy at least a boat rides triumphantly in bearing the boy to his father's arms. This may be classed as an extreme example of the use of a stage convention, but it illustrates the fact aptly. At the very least the playwright must respect the doctrines of God's existence and providence. The worst that atheistic dramatists could do would be to observe silence. In a famous play of a decade back, *Shore Acres,* the playwright made the young lover some kind of a materialist; the father of the girl objected to him on the ground of his irreligion; although this father was something of a beast the audience gave him its sympathy on this point; and the young lover as a consequence remained always a very minor character indeed in the play. James Herne, the actor, was an agnostic, it is said, and his play of *Shore Acres* proved for the time just how far one may go in silently denying the existence of God.

The third convention of the drama is respect for religion. Although religion has no place in the average play, not even in so-called religious plays like *The Sign of the Cross* and *Mary of Mag-*

dala, yet it is an absolute convention, against which the unreligious dramatist would fight in vain, that religion must be respected both directly and indirectly. In consequence you will find no sneers at religion or its ceremonies and ministers in the popular play. Wherever the playwright can use the habiliments of religion to secure a fine effect or add to a scene he is more than willing to do so; hence the processions, marriages, preaching of sermons, and other religious forms so common in the play. In anti-Catholic times the popular drama occasionally denounced the "popish superstition." That expression has disappeared from the modern English drama. Natural religion is preferred before the religions of the sects, and the commonplace about a man being superior to creed is very acceptable. That also is a sign of the times. Whatever the taste of the dramatist, manager, or actor in the matter of religion may be, this fact must stand: that religion, when it has to be mentioned or treated, must receive proper respect.

The fourth convention of the popular play is the existence and the immortality of the soul. After a course of reading in the drama of the last fifty years one would become certain that no drama could please the multitude without the acceptance of that great doctrine of Christianity. In all their troubles Blanche and Archibald, hero and heroine of the play, fall back upon the long, long bliss of eternity for consolation. If death and villainy are to separate them forever in this life, then in a happier sphere, where all tears are wiped away, they will one day be reunited. The strength and popularity of this convention is well illustrated by the last act of *The Sign of the Cross*. Every manager insists upon a happy ending for a play, since an audience must not be sent away in tears and gloom; and, as was mentioned above, the average audience takes the stage illusion so seriously as to be utterly depressed by the lamentable ill-luck of the hero and heroine. It is uncommon, therefore, for a play to end with the death of any character save the villain's. Yet in *The Sign of the Cross* the last incident of the drama is the marching forth of hero and heroine into the arena to die for Christ. How was the audience reconciled to this tragedy? By the hero's declaration that he would never again be parted from his beloved; and since she was to die for her Lord, then he would also die a Christian, be with her in her agony, and join her in paradise. His sentiment was received with tremendous applause, and the entrance of the martyrs into the arena, while it evoked showers of tears, was looked upon as a triumph over the iniquity of the persecutors. Woe to that dramatist whose characters let out their secret belief in the death of the soul with the death of the body. Managers laugh at him, and so far audiences have not encountered his plays. The most delightful moment in the perennial *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is the ascent of Little

Eva and Uncle Tom into heaven, surrounded by angels and sun-kissed clouds!

The fifth convention of the popular play is the existence and malice of sin. The theories of the materialists on sin have not yet affected the English drama, except in special instances. The theological teaching concerning sin is not strictly accepted because playwrights know nothing of theology; but the necessity and beauty of repentance are everywhere accepted and often form the matter of the play; the malice of sin is recognized both in relation to the Deity and in its evil effects upon man; ingratitude to God, injury to the sinner himself, and injustice to his dependents, or to those affected injuriously by his sins, these are staple incidents of the average play; the special malice of crimes like blasphemy, of oppression of the poor, and the helpless, of defilement of the innocent, is recognized by consigning the culprit to the lowest pits of hell; the inability of man to punish adequately in such cases leads to a passionate demand for God's immediate judgment, and to a passionate expression of belief in His justice, in the particular judgment, and in the eternity of hell. It is on points of this character that the playwright generally quotes from the Holy Scriptures. Some popular quotations are: "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone;" "God willeth not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live;" "Woman, hath no man condemned thee?" Formerly these quotations implied the common belief in the divinity of Christ; but in the last ten years indications of a change have appeared, to the effect that Christ is only the inspired Master, and not the Son of God. This change corresponds to actual conditions among Protestants. A drama from the pen of an English minister, entitled *The Only Way*, which has been touring the country for the past two years, illustrates to perfection not only the conventions so far described, but also the changes in belief that have affected the Protestant world. This play is a dramatization of Dickens' Tale of Two Cities, and the theme is the sacrifice of himself made by Sydney Carton, in order that the woman he loves may be happy forever. In the prologue an unhappy victim of the lust and cruelty of certain French noblemen calls down upon them the vengeance of God, and appoints His judgment-seat for an accounting of all his wrongs; in the body of the play chaste love, repentance for sin, and the loftiest self-sacrifice find splendid expression; yet the hero takes the place of the young husband in the prison, and mounts the scaffold to death, with seemingly no consolation from religious hope in an eternal reward. The admission of modern indifferentism in the second half of the drama is a distinct disappointment, and offers a curious contrast to Mr. Belasco's last scene in *Dubarry*, where the

priest consoles the wretched woman and rides with her in the tumbril to the scaffold. As Belasco probably professes no faith whatever, and the minister regularly preaches the gospel of his sect, the comparison is suggestive.

These five conventions of the popular play are concerned with pure Christian doctrine: the existence and providence of God, the truth and beauty of religion in general, the immortality of the soul, the existence and malice of sin and the final triumph of justice; together with their corollaries, the eternal life, judgment, heaven, hell, the need of pardon for sin, and of repentance. No play can secure presentation under ordinary circumstances, on the English-speaking stage, which does not tacitly recognize these doctrines. No playwright can afford to do worse than ignore them. The more they are respected and the more powerfully they are expressed, the more likely, other things being equal, that the play will succeed. All these conventions are commonplaces to the dramatic world, though perhaps they have never before been so distinctly formulated. For the sake of clear distinction let us call them the doctrinal conventions; then there remain the moral and the ideal conventions.

The sixth convention of the popular play demands that the hero and the heroine be exact observers of the Ten Commandments. This rule is absolute for the heroine, admitting only of exceptions that prove its universality; it is not so absolute for the hero, whose past may not have been spotless. It is absolutely necessary, however, that during the action of the play he should be perfection on this point. He must be honest, sober, chaste, clean of speech, devoted to his parents, pure, upright, honorable, the defender of women even against their own weakness, truthful to excess, faithful to friend, helpful to neighbor, true to country, and generous and forgiving to his enemies. She must be spotless, an angel lingering for a little in human form. Without this moral perfection it would be difficult to secure for the leading characters the proper sympathy. The minor characters are permitted some imperfections and sins, such as bad temper, gentle intoxication, occasional lapses from truth, and other diverting weaknesses, but only for a time; to hold the sympathy of the audience they must show a good stock of moral virtue. The villain of the play is credited with all the sins in the calendar, though the play may have proved him guilty only of injustice towards the leading characters.

The seventh convention demands lofty recognition for the ideal in life. This convention is so far-reaching, affects so intimately every part of the play, that its elucidation would need a paper by itself. Suffice it to say here that the drama in general is founded on the principle that its presentation shall give us what real life so rarely

gives, indeed cannot give: the triumphant resolution of a set of difficulties. We must see in the space of a few hours the beginning and the end of life; the anguish of virtue and the triumph of sin changed into the glorification of virtue and the eternal damnation of its enemy. In particulars the working of this convention can be seen clearly. The hero and the heroine must be young, handsome, unmarried, and virgins, with a capacity for one, undying love. The play will tolerate no widows and widowers except as minor characters; it will have nothing to do with divorce; it demands from the lovers the most exalted self-sacrifice; should one or the other (apparently) die, the survivor must utter a firm declaration to live in single blessedness and keep the grave green until heaven reunites them.

It is difficult to make an outsider understand the tremendous force of these conventions, how absolutely they rule actor, manager, and playwright. An experienced manager alone can adequately feel their power, particularly if he has suffered in the attempt to get along without them. The outsider cannot get his point of view for two reasons: he has never been a manager, and he has seen and heard of plays that rejected most of the conventions, and yet made a financial hit. These exceptions, however, only prove the rule. Some striking illustrations of the force of stage conventions exist, and are of such a nature as to be easily understood by the general public. I shall describe three of the best. First, contrast with the popular play the popular novel and the average newspaper. We are all fairly well acquainted with the influence which passing currents of thought have had upon the novel and the journal; how rapidly both have developed in the past fifty years; and how they have shaken off all restraint, whether exercised by their own conventions, or by the reading public. Every error in religion, morals, science, art, and letters, has been exploited in the popular novel; the pages of the daily journal teem with careful descriptions of crime; the editorials in all forms of the periodical press, newspaper, magazine, and review, advocate at one time or another the heresies of the past, present, and future. The country swarms with the printed page, and half of it carries the poison of the most virulent errors in doctrine or in method. The popular isms of the day, and the popular spasms as well, are in turn pompously exploited. The press is as responsive to the advent of a novel truth, or a novel error, as the mercury to the weather.

Against the winds of doctrine the popular play has stood firm for a century, intrenched in its conventions. Naturalism failed to make the slightest impression on the English drama; pessimism did not even make the attempt at an assault; only indifferentism secured a feeble success by reducing or abolishing the emotional expression

of the conventions respecting religion, and by using divorce as a reputable escape from a difficulty. The plays in which God is no longer named, in which Christian ideas are gracefully suppressed, are more numerous than formerly; yet even in these plays the dramatist must respect the conventions sufficiently to avoid the suspicion of intended offense. Now this fact alone ought to bring the drama into solid repute with the prejudiced who read their journals daily and pay due attention to the magazines. There is a worse influence working in one week's output of the press than in the whole output of the stage for ten years. Compared with the press the popular play is an instrument of religious devotion. The press is revolutionary, the play conservative. The press absorbs error as a sponge does water; the play, for reasons not easily to be discovered, holds to its traditions. The press is condemned with discrimination, and the play without it. Such is the justice of the multitude!

When we reflect how completely modern error has taken possession of the press, it is impossible to withhold credit from the drama for its fidelity to its own conventions. Another instance of their strength is shown in the failure of Ibsen and other innovators to get a hearing from the public for their sickly dramas. Ibsenism is only a term for unhealthy and unprofitable innovation. Pinero has tried it. Paul Potter has tried it. French innovators are a legion. They have all failed to get a footing. Great assaults have been made, now on a single convention, now on a group, and occasionally on all. Dumas attacked the ideal love in *Camille*, Pinero did the same thing only the other day in *Iris*, Paul Potter made his hero a vile brute in *The Conquerors*, Stuart Robson made him an atheist in *The Gadfly*, Dumas tried again in *Denise*, Charles Frohman attempted to popularize adultery in adaptations from French comedies, Belasco lately gave us *Zaza* and *Dubarry:* it may be said comprehensively that they all failed. Dumas and Belasco made money, the others lost it; but with or without success no imitators came after them to emphasize their triumph or their failure. Ibsen is to-day the arch-conspirator against the stage conventions. He can write, more deftly than any living playwright, a drama in which there will be no God, no religion, no humanity, no faith, no morality, no love, no thought of eternity; which will reek of despair, dirt, darkness, and diabolism; which will shut out music, light, mirth, scenery, all graceful illusion; and from which an audience will fly in haste to the light of day, or the nearest buffet, dumb with horror. His plays have not disturbed the old, firm conventions. His friends storm the theatre in vain. It is a good deal to have withstood, not only the assaults of the time, but the direct siege of engineers like Ibsen.

The third example of the power of the old conventions appeals more to the Catholic than to others, and forms a fitting companion to the historic fact that the miracle plays are the source of the modern drama. The popular play enjoys an ever-growing sympathy with Catholic doctrine and practice. It is a long time since in the Surrey Theatre, London, Bulwer-Lytton gave us *Richelieu*, John Frederick Smith introduced his *Wolsey*, and Dion Boucicault pleased an audience with *The Pope of Rome*. Yet in the interval how kindly and effectively has the drama taken to Catholic personages, doctrines, and ceremonies! We have seen *The Parish Priest* working lovingly among his people, *The Cardinal* torn with anguish over the fate of his innocent brother, *Francesca Da Rimini* married by the cardinal in the stately cathedral with proper ceremonies, *The Eternal City* and its reverential pope, *The Broken Seal* with its holy but weak-minded Curé; and Thomas á Becket has fallen under blows of the assassin, Mary of Scotland has gone to her death, and Joan of Arc ascended the dreadful pile amid the tears of Protestants who softly cursed the persecutors of these noble souls. Actors have learned to wear sacred vestments, to take holy water properly, to bless themselves, to genuflect before the great altar, to visit the pope, to give a blessing, to give communion to the dying, and to bury the dead in the good, holy Catholic fashion; anl audiences have even attended Mass as it were, have learned the beauty of Catholic rites, and have applauded to the echo popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, saints, and heroes of the Catholic faith, because in the play these stood forth as the champions of justice, and the protectors of the poor, the helpless, the innocent against the injustice of power. This sympathy of the play with things Catholic is emphasized by the indifference of the play to things Protestant. Outside of a marriage the bare Protestant rites have no place on the stage. Of course they lack the requisite picturesqueness. Protestant personages have rarely been made characters in a drama, largely because early Protestantism denounced the play and the player with equal vigor. Protestant themes, historic, social, or doctrinal, have entirely disappeared from the horizon of the average playwright. At the present moment Luther, Cranmer, Knox, Henry VIII. are impossible characters for the drama; while Richelieu is everlasting; and Hall Caine, after giving us Pius X. in *The Eternal City*, threatens us with an historic pope of the past for some future drama.

The character and the strength of these stage conventions, as described and illustrated in this article, ought to convince the most skeptical of the conservatism and worth of the popular play, ought to warn the wise to take instruction in the actual conditions before indulging in wholesale condemnation, and should urge a strict

examination of present temper towards the stage in general. In my opinion religious sentiment is barking up the wrong tree; the popular press, and not the popular play, is the coon to be dislodged. It is a patent fact that the press daily offends, in one fashion or another, against the first principles of Christian faith and Christian morality; as a matter of fact the press of America is the product of the purest indifferentism, and the strenuous, bigoted, blind advocate of that powerful error. The play has indeed been affected by the indifferentism of the playwright, but in a different way and to a slight degree. The force of the conventions, as I have shown, nullifies the malice of the playwright. This may be seen more clearly in the actual presentation of such plays as *A Parisian Romance, Jekyll and Hyde*, and *Marie Stuart*, the two first as played by Richard Mansfield, and the third, a translation from Schiller, by Madame Modjeska. The first preaches a distinct sermon on materialism, the second illustrates a moral principle, and the third overthrows for the audience a powerful political philosophy, which has dominated the English world for several centuries. Yet it can hardly be supposed that the playwrights or the actors had these results in view at any time.

The leading character of *A Parisian Romance* is the Baron De Chevrial, a rich blackguard, devoted at the age of seventy to the sensual pleasures, the crimes, which have marked his whole career. His brutal cynicism inspires the audience with disgust, his praise of earthly pleasure revolts them, and his ending, while it terrifies, satisfies them by its justice. In the fourth act of this play the Baron entertains at a dinner a number of dissipated young men and women; at the proper moment he rises to offer a blasphemous toast to materialism, the god whom he has always worshiped, the only god worth worshipping, to whom he is indebted for his success and his pleasures; and at this precise moment he is struck by death, paralysis destroys one-half his body, his god deserts him at the instant of praise; the frightened banqueters, to whom death is the devil, run from him in terror, and the old reprobate staggers about the room like a wounded wild beast, mumbling and cursing, until he falls stone dead. Whatever the intention of playwright or actor in this play the sermon on materialism is more perfect, more effective, from the merely human point of view, than the finest utterances of a Lacordaire.

The drama of *Jekyll and Hyde* illustrates the moral principle that men become very like the things they love. It would take a long time in ordinary speech to convince an audience of this truth, even with such common illustrations as the drunkard, the gambler, and the sensualist. In this play Dr. Jekyll has discovered the secret of

changing his noble personality at will into the monstrous character of James Hyde. By swallowing a certain powder the elegant figure, upright nature, and clean soul of Dr. Jekyll are instantly transformed into the deformed body, vile nature, and black soul of Hyde; in this character he steeps himself in the most loathsome vice, becomes more and more in love with vice, and changes so often into the character of Hyde that at last the transformation occurs automatically in sleep, against his will, without the use of the powder. The last act of the play shows the wretched man in hiding from the police, unable to secure the antidote which hinders him from becoming Hyde, dreading that inevitable metamorphosis, and still more the terrors of the law gathering around him. From his window he sees the good girl whom he loved passing along the street below, and in his anguish he cries out to her; she recognizes her lost lover and flies to him; but at that moment the police hammer at the door, with a convulsion the form of Jekyll shrinks into the proportions of Hyde, and he has just time to swallow the ready and instant poison when love and law enter to witness his death agony. The lesson to that audience is perfect, unforgettable, frightful; men become like the things they love.

Schiller's play of *Marie Stuart* is ancient in form and prosy and slow in presentation; but its contrast of the Queen of Scotland with the Queen of England does not lack interest. Marie Stuart has the first act, Elisabeth Tudor the second, both monarchs meet in the third act, Elisabeth signs the death-warrant in the fourth act, and in the fifth Marie takes leave of her friends and goes to execution. The ancient controversy over the Queen of Scots is still pending, and the latest book on the subject from Andrew Lang leaves the reputation of Queen Mary still in doubt. Elisabeth is no longer known as the Virgin Queen and Good Queen Bess except in a political sense. For three hundred years the writers of England with few exceptions found it necessary to labor earnestly in presenting a Marie Stuart to the people, which might serve their aims and ambitions; therefore Marie Stuart became a monster of iniquity, a human representative of the abstract Church of Rome, the scarlet woman, the woman of Babylon, the harlot of the seven hills; while Elisabeth, as her antagonist, was portrayed with honors, virtues, little short of the divine. This impression of the two queens still remains with the multitude. In three hours with Schiller's old play Madame Modjeska will destroy for any audience listening to her the political philosophy which engaged the abilities of all England for three centuries to build. Schiller's play, Madame Modjeska, and Agnes Strickland in her histories did more to bury that philosophy for the common people than all others combined.

This array of facts touching the popular play will naturally be accepted with suspicion by determined enemies of the drama in any form, and shelved on the kindly principle that the devil is never so black as painted. Is the play then so spotless, so perfect, that no one dare reproach it? Have we all been wrong in the suspicion, the distrust, the denunciation of the past century? Have we had to wait for a Daniel-come-to-judgment in order to discover our blunders and errors? Must we now turn to the theatre as to the temple and make amends for past hostility by sublime devotion? The answer to these moving questions is not difficult. Proof of the moral cleanness of Asbury Park does not bind anyone to spend a summer at that popular resort. Morally only two things are demanded of those convinced by this presentation of a fine case: to speak kindly of the popular play, and never again to denounce that of which they know little or nothing. The popular play is neither spotless morally, nor perfect artistically, only a trifle better than its playwrights, actors, managers, and audiences. It possesses their vulgarity, cheapness, low standard of thought, common expression, tawdry pride. Its minor conventions are for the most part sickly and inartistic, such as the love-making, which entitles the hero to treat a woman with disrespectful familiarity. He clasps her in his arms and talks into her mouth as if he were a throat specialist studying her bronchitis. The popular play always smacks of the times. It has a long way to climb towards perfection. The point made in this article is its fidelity to its own wise conventions. Another point is its superiority to that besotted press which floods the homes of the righteous, and from whose unclean pages the righteous get their bricks to fling at the play.

One fact with regard to the drama and the stage must be recognized and cheerfully accepted: they are institutions which have come to stay, and which will always be a great factor in public amusement. The over-delicate custom of past times, to run away from such a difficulty as an unclean drama, or to shut it out of society altogether, excommunicate actors and playwrights, and put the play and the players on a level with the bagnio and its promoters, is not suited to our methods and conditions. The play is universal. It has a footing in our convents and colleges almost as firm as in the days of St. Gregory of Nazianzen. Thousands of amateur actors have made it familiar in our parishes. If it be still a savage, an immoral barbarian, then we must do with it as Lacordaire advised with regard to Democracy: baptize it. A force so powerful with the people, a popular amusement so charming in itself, and so capable of great things, a fact so deeply rooted in the nature and the history of man, is not to be left entirely to the devil. Although the stage has been

carefully excluded from this essay, as a different question altogether, I would still include it in the regeneration of the drama, on the ground of its influence over the people. One remark will fitly close this article: whatever good exists in the popular play at this moment may be credited to the strength of its own fine conventions: whatever evil, to the indifference and hostility of the badly instructed good citizens of English-speaking lands.

JOHN TALBOT SMITH.

New York.

THE EXAMPLE OF NAPOLEON.

TO believers in the providence of God the question naturally presents itself at the present day, what will be ultimately the divine action in regard to the governments now persecuting the church in Europe. In Italy the Pope is still a prisoner in his palace and garden of the Vatican. In France the twentieth century opens with one of the most determined campaigns against religion. To say that it is directed only against the religious orders, means nothing. No one can be so simple as to honestly say it is not the Catholic, i. e., in the judgment of Frenchmen, the Christian, religion which is attacked. Humanly speaking, there is no hope for the poor Christians. They are apparently so inert and divided, and, after all, those of them who really deserve the name of Christians, so poor a minority, that little can be expected from any activity on their part. What then will Heaven do? Will God interfere to show that He still exists? He may not. God has permitted so much evil in this world that it is not easy to forecast what will be the direction or nature of His interference with human events. He permitted the terrible Mahometan inundation; He permitted the Protestant reform. What will He allow the infidel revolution of modern times to effect? A mystery indeed it is that the Almighty should permit the loss of so many human souls. But we know that He loves us, we know that His Son died for us. We know that He tolerates evil only to draw from it greater good, although that greater good may be invisible to our eyes. For even though the whole ancient civilized world should lose its integrity of faith, we could still hope that, in ways unknown to us, He would be able to save innumerable souls.

We must not then fear He is going to let once Catholic Europe fall entirely under the empire of Satan. We must hope especially

that He will not permit Italy, the centre of Christianity, where St. Peter established his see, and France, so long so gloriously Catholic, and where there is still so much faith and religion, to fall entirely under the heel of the conspiracy against religion and morality and truth. For we have instances too of the divine interference which are calculated to greatly encourage us, and to remind us that the Lord does not forget the world which He made. The story of the first Napoleon naturally occurs to the mind in this circumstance, it is full of teaching, and its teaching is that God will not abandon those who truly trust in Him, and though He may appear to be asleep like our Lord in the ship, His eye is always on His own, and He will so direct the course of human events that finally all things shall result to the benefit of His elect.

Napoleon Bonaparte was not originally a persecutor. He had been brought up in a Christian manner, had made his first Communion, and never wholly lost his belief in the Christian revelation. In the military school to which he was sent, he did not certainly inhale an atmosphere of piety, nor did he continue to practise his religion in the exciting days of the French revolution, which were coincident with his youth. He was carried away too by the high-sounding platitudes of the times, for he was human though a genius and very imperfectly educated. It is probable that his religious ideas were very greatly mixed from this want of thorough training. But, with his great intellect and extraordinary sense, he could hardly have made any great blunders had his motives been pure and free from passion. It was his selfishness, his desire to subject the interests of souls to what he considered the interests of the state, his gigantic ambition, a pride fed by unexampled success, which made him turn against the church of God and become in particular the enemy of the father of the faithful.

It was another chapter in the history of the contests between church and state. Very interesting and instructive indeed is this study of the varying attitudes towards each other in history of the state and the church. The relative, sometimes antagonistic, positions of science and revealed religion, is one of the burning questions of the present time. But perhaps no more important subject can occupy the attention of a Catholic, layman or cleric, than the story of the relations between the ecclesiastical authority which we call the church and that civil jurisdiction which is known as the state. These two independent sources of right have had to move down the stream of time side by side; it is clear it was for the advantage of both that they should move on harmoniously; it is equally clear that there must have frequently been danger of their jarring or clashing together. And, like the pots in the fable, it is clear enough

too, that, in this encounter, the weaker vessel would naturally be the sufferer. One reflection must be made, however, as to this point: what may appear the weaker material at the moment may be the stronger in the long run, may have the better wear. Thus the church *appeared* crushed by the Roman Emperors: in reality the Roman empire was destroyed, not the church. During the middle ages there was an everlasting struggle between the church and the German empire; the German empire disappeared, the church is as full of life as ever. A new German empire has been established, and hardly had it begun its existence when it wished to tussle with the church. But the man of blood and iron, who vowed he would not go to Canossa, was the first one to see that the empire, that is, the state, could not get on without the church, and he did not hesitate to make *volte-face* and go to Canossa, almost before being asked. A wise man he. And wise is his government in imitating his example and following every day more and more in his footsteps. Thanks for this to the heroic German centre party. While the Irish were united, they held the balance of power in the English parliament. So long as the German centre maintains its sturdy independence, it will control the destiny of Germany—and Germany will have reason to be grateful to its members. In what other country to-day do we find anything like this?

How the French revolution was brought about, how it developed its satanical character of hostility to religion, it does not concern us to dwell on here. What the world knows is that the first French republic met the fate which always attends anarchy combined with immorality. When the Greek republics, politically divided as they were, had degenerated from their early hardihood of life, it was no difficult task for Alexander of Macedon to subject them to his sway. When the Roman republic, having lost its primitive austerity of morals amid the corruption which seems to be the necessary consequence of a great accumulation of wealth, was worn out by the strife of opposing factions, then Julius Cæsar appeared, and he made himself master of Rome and the Roman world. The French republic was more an anarchy than a government, the result of the troubled fermentation of men who had denied all religion; it found its Alexander and its Cæsar in Napoleon Bonaparte. This is a law of history. We should pray that our own dear country, that country which we all proudly look to as the hope of the future for all mankind, which is only one century old, which has already gone through the throes of the most terrible of civil wars, which has already trembled before the prospect of a military dictatorship, which is so large, which has entered on a new adventurous course of expansion, wherein the socialistic doctrines of the day find an ever increasing

multitude of listeners, we should pray that God will spare it, that He will save it from political disunion and moral degradation, and so save it from the worst of all calamities for men who love manliness and the liberty of their own souls, from a Cæsar or an Alexander or a Bonaparte. And therefore for this reason we should ask that unbelief may not spread throughout the land, for with unbelief will spread theft and lust, and they will bring ruin; but that religion may cover it with her holy wings, and establish that reign of justice which exalteth nations and on which Heaven sends down its everlasting blessing.

On the 14th of March, 1800, Pius VII. was elected Pope. His predecessor had died a captive in France in the month of August of the preceding year. "At that time," says the Protestant historian, Ranké, "it seemed as if the Papal power was forever at an end." Indeed it did: the French republicans had swept through Italy; they first robbed the Pope of all his money; then they seized on his possessions, depriving him of his temporal power, but declaring, like Victor Emmanuel in the name of the Italian people to the late Pius IX., that he should remain a spiritual prince; then they carried him away a prisoner to die in exile. But after the death of the Sovereign Pontiff the French arms met with reverses in Italy, so that the Cardinals were able to meet in conclave, and the Cardinal Chiaramonti, bishop of Imola, was elected Pope, under the title of Pius VII. The circumstance which caused the French to meet with defeat in Italy, and so gave an opportunity to the Cardinal princes of the Catholic Church to elect a new Pontiff, was the recall of the general who had gained those victories by which the French had become masters of the Italian peninsula. Thus did it happen, as it has happened many times over and over again in days of distress and amidst the gale of persecution, that Almighty God interfered at the most critical moment and evidently so directed the course of events as to prevent the bark of Peter from being shipwrecked in the storm. Should therefore the thirteenth Leo die, as the sixth Pius and the ninth Pius did, while yet a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, we shall have just cause to hope that they who already rejoice in the approaching ruin of the Papacy will not have a real reason for triumph, that God will watch over His little ones, that He will protect those who have to minister to them and will provide another pastor for His fold, and that He will make all things conduce to the greater glory of His holy name.

The general who, by defeating the Austrians, had conquered Italy, was Napoleon Bonaparte, the man destined to reëstablish order in France and to keep all Europe in constant war for half a generation. Hardly had the Pope been elected when Napoleon was sent back to

Italy, where he again drove the Austrians from that country, another manifest indication that he had been withdrawn by Divine Providence only in order that the Catholic Church might have the necessary respite and freedom to elect another head to fill the place of its departed ruler. The conqueror of Italy and Egypt was soon declared first consul or chief governor of France, and he at once set about restoring order and good administration to that distracted nation. He framed a perfect code of laws and reorganized all the branches of government. But his great intellect understood that he could not regenerate a people unless he established among them some kind of a religion; for without religion no society is possible; no society has ever actually existed without religion; infidels themselves have said that it would be necessary to invent a religion, if there were none, to preserve society; and, without its powerful control, it is too late in the world's history for even our modern theorizers and reformers to expect to be able to keep men together in any kind of social union. But Bonaparte wished to reinstate the true religion in that land from which it had been violently expelled or driven to be practised in covert retreats, and this for several very good reasons. First, he was himself a believer, he had been taught the Catholic faith, and he admitted to one of his marshals that the happiest day of his life was, not when he had won a great victory, but the day of his first Communion; secondly, he knew that the majority of the French people were still attached to their traditional belief and would change it for no other; and, thirdly, he was aware that no form of worship has such power in subjecting men's hearts to true obedience to all legitimate laws as that ancient and Catholic religion so severely inflexible in its principles and so sweetly gentle in the method of inculcating and enforcing its precepts. At this time Bonaparte showed his strong sense in opposition to the suggestions of those around him, and proved that he was not altogether a bad man where his own ambition was not interested. He would not make himself the head of a new church, he knew better than that. "Do you wish me to be crucified?" he said to those who urged him to found a religion of his own. He believed it was the unity of the Catholic faith which made France strong; and he knew that without the *true* faith that unity could not exist. Protestantism therefore with its divisions had no charm for him, and, great as was his confidence in himself, he did not think that he could unite Frenchmen in believing in a doctrine of his own creation, unless, like our Lord, he died in proof of his divinity, a thing which he was not prepared to do. But here his wisdom ended. He knew that he could not make the state a church, but he did not know that he could not subordinate the church to the state. He did not wish to make himself

Pope, but he thought that he could subject the Pope to himself. He did not wish to call Cæsar God, but he thought that he could cause to be given to Cæsar the things which belonged to God. Accordingly one of the first acts of the young Corsican general after assuming power in France was to open negotiations with the Holy See for the restoration of divine worship in that country. These negotiations led to the famous *concordat* or agreement between the French government and the Pope, by which ecclesiastical discipline was regulated in the French republic in such a way as to assure harmony between the spiritual and the temporal powers.

A very singular episode in church history is connected with the *pourparlers* for affecting this concordat. Napoleon asked that all the ancient episcopal sees in France and the countries annexed to France be suppressed and new ones established more coincident with the revolutionary divisions of the country into departments. And this was to be done within a few days. The Holy Father had therefore to ask all the bishops still living to send in their resignations, that, abolishing the old dioceses, he might appoint bishops to the new ones. This was certainly a tremendous exercise of the Papal power. But it was not beyond that power, and circumstances made it necessary. A few French bishops refused to resign, and so originated the schism of the *petite église*, a little body of Christians more Christian than the Pope. This little schism, more political than religious, like so many things in France, continued to live on till the end of the nineteenth century. Fourteen hundred years before, the Catholic bishops of Africa, with St. Augustine at their head, had offered unanimously to lay down their mites in favor of the Donatists, if these would return to the bosom of the church—a more perfect example of the true episcopal spirit.

On Easter Sunday, 1802, the solemn sacrifice of the Mass was offered up, for the first time in ten years, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris by the Cardinal-legate of the Holy See, in the presence of the first Consul and all the great French officials. The French revolution was at an end apparently: a new order of things was inaugurated: the church came out from the crucible of persecution through which she had passed, pure, unalloyed, vigorous, and that church of France, which, since that time, has had to battle and has to battle, against so many elements of infidelity and hostility, has proved, by the conduct and integrity of its clergy and its episcopacy, that the trials of persecution did it no harm. We must not suppose, however, that the behavior of the first Consul in this business was all that could be desired by fervent Catholics. Partly on account of the circumstances of the time and the necessity of yielding to the wishes of others perhaps in some points, partly, and in

great measure no doubt, on account of his own looseness of religious principle, shaken as it was by his education in the midst of infidels and revolutionists, and his indisposition to grant too much power to a church which he wished to control while leaving it what he considered sufficient liberty, the young ruler hampered the concordat with conditions which entailed great sacrifices on the part of the Holy See. In the first place, all the confiscated church property was to be left in the hands of its purchasers. The church never haggles on account of this world's goods, she belongs to another sphere, and knows that the Lord who chose poverty for His own bride will always provide sufficiently for her sustenance, and that He often allows her to be despoiled of her earthly goods in order to enrich her with more spiritual treasures; this point offered no difficulty. Then it was required, as has been said, that new limits should be appointed to all the dioceses in France and that all the ancient and expatriated bishops should give in their resignations in order that new ones might be named in their place. This too the church submitted to. The Holy Father even appointed to the new bishoprics, to please the French government, several schismatical and excommunicated prelates, after however they had made their submission, asked forgiveness and obtained absolution from their censures. There was nothing to which the Catholic Church would not stoop to save thirty millions of souls, except that which was wrong in itself. In all this negotiation whenever anything was proposed by the French government which was contrary to Catholic principle and the duty of the head of the Christian Church, it was inflexibly refused. The Consul or his ministers appended to the rest of the concordat a series of "organic articles," so they were called, which had never been agreed to by the Papal envoy, and which were intended to subject absolutely the clergy to the civil government. These articles the Pope never accepted, and, though succeeding governments tried sometimes to resuscitate them, they have never had in France any effect.

In the year 1804 Bonaparte changed his title of Consul for the higher one to which since his return from Egypt he had aspired, and was thenceforth known as Napoleon, first Emperor of the French. On the 14th of September of that year he wrote to Pope Pius an autograph letter, asking him to come to Paris to perform the ceremony of his coronation. Pius VII. was a gentle and benign Pontiff. With all Europe he admired this wonderful young man, this genius created by providence to draw order out of the chaos which two centuries of infidelity and heresy had brought about in Europe and which reached its climax in the horrors and wars of the French revolution. But Pius the VII. was moreover a father, he was the

father of the whole Christian Catholic Church, and he had the heart of a father for all his children. It is certain, strange as their relations afterwards became, that there existed to the end in the heart of the Pontiff a great affection for this wayward child of fortune, who, after receiving his first education from a Christian mother, was sent at the early age of ten to a military school, there to be surrounded during his youth by an atmosphere impregnated with every kind of evil, and who now in his early manhood, notwithstanding his strength of intellect, was already intoxicated by the glory of unprecedented military success. With cheerfulness therefore the Holy Pontiff yielded to the invitation to crown the young conqueror, in the hope no doubt that his very presence would exercise a beneficial influence on one whom he would not willingly believe to be bad at heart and who still possessed the Catholic faith. The two monarchs, the spiritual ruler and the temporal ruler, met at Fontainebleau on the 25th of November, 1804, and on the second of the following month the ceremony of coronation took place.

What a terrible thing it is to become the slave of any passion! Napoleon was now in his zenith. Could he be content with enough, were it in his power to put a limit to his ambition, he might have founded the most powerful dynasty which ever reigned in Europe. The limits of France had been pushed to their furthest extent, the influence of the young French emperor was all powerful all over the continent; with his great intellect and genius, with his talent for organization, and his military prestige to be called upon to back and enforce his wishes in case of need, the new sovereign might have peacefully swayed and governed by wise policy and discretion a subservient Europe; and, had he given himself up wholly, like St. Louis and Charlemagne, to the cause of Christian revelation, had he undertaken in the proper way to oppose and stem the revolutionary tide which was then, and is still to-day, threatening to engulf the world in the waters of a new deluge, had he opposed it and checked it and dried it up in its source by devoting all his energies and all his influence to the religious education of his people, so as, by enlightening them on their duties towards God and on God's providence over them, to make them at the same time good citizens and happy subjects, he could have ruled like Constantine and Charlemagne over the whole of united Christendom. But Napoleon Bonaparte was the slave of personal ambition. He may have been blind in part to this fact, and imagined that he wished to subject all nations to France, which he had necessarily subjected to himself. But to this ambition he sacrificed all things. Already he had imbued his hands with the blood of the innocent duke of Enghien, a provoked but still an unjustifiable crime, which made the author of it

feared and detested by every nation. To this ambition he sacrificed his first wife, Josephine, after many years of union; for this ambition he obliged his brother to annul his marriage with an American lady in order that he might espouse a European princess. It was this ambition which brought on his quarrels with the Holy Father, and, by leading him into a constant series of unnecessary wars, became finally the cause of his fall, the loss of everything and the miserable termination of his career.

In 1805 war broke out between England, Austria and Russia on the one side and the Emperor of the French on the other. Napoleon ordered his general St. Cyr to occupy Aneona in the Papal States. This was the first positive step which the new despot had taken to show his intention of ruling over the Papal States as temporal master, and all the remonstrances of the Holy Father had no affect in inducing him to go back upon the deed. His final answer to the head of the church was insolent in the extreme. It was followed by a demand that all the subjects of governments hostile to the Emperor, English, Russians and Swedes, should be expelled from the Pontifical territory. "All Italy must be subject to my law," wrote the Emperor to the Pope. "I will not touch the independence of the Holy See, but on the condition that your Holiness will have for me in the temporal order the same deference that I bear towards you in spiritual matters. You are sovereign in Rome, but I am also Emperor there." But Pius VII., mild as he was, was not the man to yield to the unjust demands of any earthly monarch. Already when he had gone to crown the emperor in France, he had left his abdication in Rome to be made use of in case he were detained a prisoner by his rude host; he had no intention of keeping the empty title of head of a church without any independence, like the Archbishop of Canterbury in England or the Synod of the Russian church in St. Petersburg. Therefore all Europe might crouch before the Conqueror, emperors might change their titles and kings might resign their thrones at his pleasure; he might be allowed to place crowns and coronets on the heads of all his relations and favorites; there was one old man, the ruler of an insignificantly small territory, who would not yield to please his wish one iota of what he knew it to be his duty to maintain. Thus wrote the Pope to the Emperor: "The Pontiff does not recognize, and has never recognized, in his states any power superior to his own. You are immensely great, but you have been elected and crowned Emperor of the French, not of Rome." And the following words are to be noticed as furnishing a key to the necessity for the temporal independence of the Holy See. "A Catholic sovereign is such only because he bows before the definitions of the visible head of the Church, and regards the Pontiff as

the teacher of truth, as the only Vicar of God on earth. *Such feelings cannot be those of a sovereign towards another sovereign.*" But the pride of the soldier of fortune had now carried him to an excess of conceit which surpasses all imaginable extravagance. "He (Napoleon)," he writes again to the Holy Father, "was not only the greatest warrior of the age, but if he were a little more master of the world, he would show what a Sovereign Pontiff he would make, he would prove himself more wise and pious than Pius himself, he would take better care of souls, and generally attend better to the interests of religion." In fact Bonaparte, who could do what he pleased in the temporal sphere, and had his ambition already sated in that respect, aspired to rule over souls as well as bodies. What did it profit him that men should bow their necks to his yoke, if they would not also submit their consciences to his will? "Who are these priests," he exclaimed, "who keep men's souls, and throw me only their carcases?" "I was not born at the right time," he said to a courtier; "Alexander the Great called himself the son of Jupiter, and no one dared to contradict him. I find in my time a man stronger than myself and he is a priest, for he reigns over spirits and I govern mere matter." What a commentary on the vanity of human pride and ambition! Here is a man who wishes to be excelled by no one who ever lived, and because he cannot obtain the impossible he is unhappy. It ought not to have been difficult to foretell what would be the conduct of the man who could so speak towards that other man whose superior powers he envied, of the soldier toward the priest. He began by withdrawing his ambassador from Rome, and replacing him by one more fitted for the execution of violent measures. He next takes military possession of a great part of the pontifical territory. "Tell the Emperor," said the Pope to the departing Ambassador, "that, in spite of his ill-treatment, we preserve a deep feeling of attachment to the French nation. But we are sovereign and shall remain independent. If he uses violence, we shall protest before the world. If necessary we shall use the temporal and spiritual means which God has placed in our hands."

"His Holiness dares to threaten me," wrote Napoleon. "His thoughts are centuries behind the age. There were kings before there were popes. What does he mean by denouncing me to Christendom? Does he intend to excommunicate me? and if he does, will his excommunication cause the muskets to fall from my soldiers' hands?" These very words show that the Emperor had misgivings as to his own conduct. Much more wisely had he spoken, and by much better inspiration, when, six years before, in answer to the question of the first envoy whom he sent to Rome, how should the Holy Father be treated. "Treat him," answered the then Consul;

"treat him as though he had two hundred thousand soldiers at his back." But Napoleon was older now, that blush of modesty which accompanies the elevation of almost any man to power for the first time had worn off, and the conqueror of the world could no longer make the effort even to disguise his illimitable arrogance. Not till the 2d of February, 1808, however, did the French troops enter the city itself of Rome, and only on the 10th of June, 1809, at ten o'clock in the morning, the pontifical flag was lowered from the Castle of St. Angelo amid the thunder of artillery, and the tricolor hoisted in its place. This was the consummation of the crime of sacrilege and spoilation: the next morning a Papal bull was found posted at the gates of the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Mary Major and St. John Lateran, wherein, after relating how, on the feast of the Purification, while he was himself offering up the divine sacrifice, the capital of Christendom had been sacrilegiously invaded, after enumerating the excesses committed during the following year and a half, similar in character to those perpetrated by the present occupiers of the holy city, after declaring that if, as related in scripture, Naboth could not give up the vineyard which was his inheritance from his forefathers, much less could he, the Supreme Pontiff, yield up the vineyard confided to his custody by the Lord, the Holy Father pronounces the sentence of greater excommunication against those who have taken part in these outrages.

What was the pretext which the French Emperor made use of to deprive the Father of the faithful of his temporal possessions? Because he persisted in not violating his duty as a neutral. Napoleon published an edict declaring all the ports of England in a state of blockade. Though he had no fleet to blockade them, so submissive were the continental powers to the will of the autocrat that they ceased commercial relations with the island-kingdom. Napoleon sends orders to the Sovereign Pontiff to expel English and other subjects from the city and forbid English vessels entering his ports; the Pontiff, the weakest of temporal kings, though France was supposed to be a Catholic power and the English were a Protestant people, answers that he cannot in conscience violate his duty towards a nation with which he is at peace—and Napoleon in consequence strips him of his territory.

In the middle of the night of the 5th and 6th of July, a band of brigands—for such only could they be called—broke into the pontifical palace, and the Sovereign Pontiff was hurried secretly away from the centre of Christendom and forced to enter upon a long exile. For a short distance he was allowed the company of his dearest friend, the Cardinal Pacca, but so hasty was their departure that they found that the Holy Father had with him only twenty-two

pence and the Cardinal sixteen. "Truly an apostolic way," exclaimed the Pontiff, "to begin an expedition." The hardships and unnecessary cruelty of this journey I pass over; but, just as when the hordes of Victor Emmanuel broke into the holy city under the ninth Pius, so when this gentle and venerable champion of the rights of independent states, Pius VII., was dragged ruffianly through Italy and France, all Europe looked on in silence, no government raised its voice to protest against the deed, "a striking illustration of the truth," says Cardinal Pacca in his *Memoires*, "that the successor of St. Peter must not put his trust in princes." The chief pastor of the church, however, was not without consolation in the midst of all his afflictions. Everywhere that he passed he was received with ovations by the populations, in France as well as in Italy; all pressed to receive his blessing, and their sympathy was enough to make him forget the hardship of his treatment. Yet he sank under this hardship. During the passage from Savona to Fontainebleau, he became so ill that it was necessary to administer the last sacraments. Nevertheless travelling was not suspended a moment; the great bully was trying to frighten the old man, the soldier was trying to conquer by violence the minister of peace. A vain effort. But more artful means followed. The bishops of France, all of them appointed to their sees by Napoleon, did not at this time behave, as a body, with the courage which has so often distinguished the episcopacy of that country. Many of them tried to cajole out of the Holy Father concessions which were contrary to his conscience. Not all, however, but those who did not were deprived of their bishoprics and cast into prison. Napoleon had obliged most of the Cardinals to come to Paris, that he might parade them at his court. Thirteen of the number refused to be present at his second marriage while his first wife was still living, unauthorized as they knew it to be by the Pope. They exposed themselves to the danger of death from the anger of their infuriated tyrant. Death he did threaten to some, but he feared to make martyrs, and confined himself actually to punishing them by obliging them to lay aside their purple robes and dress in simple black like common priests. Hence they were afterwards known as the black cardinals. One simple priest, however, knew how to face and subdue this wild untamed offspring of the mountains of Corsica. This was M. Emery, the superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, a man eighty years of age. "How is it," said Napoleon to him, "that you and all the bishops of France who have studied theology all your lives, that you cannot find any way of settling my difficulties with the Pope? Had I studied divinity but six months, I would easily solve the difficulty, for God has given me understanding." "Who is the Pope?" asked he again one day of the same man in a tone of furious

anger, in one of his frequent fits of unrestrained violence. "The Pope," answered the venerable priest, "is what he is said to be in the catechism taught by your Majesty's order in all the churches of France. The Pope is the head of the church, the vicar of Christ, to whom all Christians owe obedience." "The Abbé Emery," afterwards said the Emperor, "speaks like a man who knows what he is talking about." "Had Napoleon found in all the bishops of France," is the reflection of the Cardinal Pacca, "the same energy and prudence, he would never have become a persecutor."

God is slow, very slow, for He has all eternity behind Him. On the very day when the Holy Father was carried away from Rome, Bonaparte gained the great victory of Wagram; heaven seemed to be still heaping successes upon him. But England yet braved him and Russia, and all Asia beyond it, still remained unsubjected. On the 9th day of May, 1812, at the head of an army of six hundred and fifty thousand men, he set out to subdue Russia, or rather to subdue the world. This vast army was composed of the best disciplined veteran troops, who had never known defeat, and who, under Napoleon himself, believed themselves invincible. At Dresden eight monarchs came to offer him their homage. "During his stay in this city," says the historian Alison, "four kings were frequently to be seen waiting in his ante-chamber; queens were the maids of honor to Maria Louisa. With more than Eastern magnificence he distributed diamonds and gold and crosses among the innumerable crowd of princes, ministers, dukes and courtiers who thronged around his steps." Meanwhile the Holy Father was being hurried from Italy to France in a journey which was uninterrupted even while he was being administered the last sacraments of the church. On the 23d of June the army reached the river Niemen which divided the territories of Russia and Prussia. As the Emperor rode along the bank, his horse stumbled and threw him to the ground. The general de Ségur, an eye-witness, has left us a vivid account of the disastrous campaign which followed. Over the desert earth, following an enemy who always fled away and could never be found, the French soldiers began to suffer from every privation. It was now God's time. Every element was turned against the invading army, earth, air, fire and water. On their very entrance into the Russian Empire they were saluted by a terrific storm, which occasioned to them the loss of ten thousand horses. After many delays and calamities they reached the city of Moscow, but it was to see it destroyed at night by fire kindled by the hands of its own inhabitants. But what saddened the French officers above all was to see that their chief had no longer his accustomed vigor: in mind and body he appeared no longer the same man. A

miserable infirmity, the same from which his nephew habitually suffered, disabled him from attending with his usual strength of mind to the direction of affairs. It became necessary to retreat. And now let us listen to the words of the historian of this march. Bonaparte had often repeated to Cardinal Caprara what he had written to Eugene Beauharnais. "Does the pope think that his excommunication will make the muskets fall from the hands of my soldiers?" "On the 6th of November," writes de Ségur, "the sky becomes covered, the snow begins to fall accompanied by gusts of wind, as though the heavens were coming down to join with the earth and this hostile people to consummate our ruin. The frozen soldiers fall on the snow, which covers them until the whole line of march is filled with these mounds of human bodies like graves in a graveyard. . . . . *Their weapons appeared to their stiffened hands to be an insupportable burden. Frequently they stumbled and their guns falling from their hands were lost in the snow. They did not throw them away; cold and hunger snatched them from their grasp.*" When the main portion of the French army crossed the Beresina, it was reduced to ten thousand men. There the Emperor abandoned it, and the horrible sufferings which still remained for it to undergo, we may here omit.

Five months after the Holy Father had been brought to Fontainebleau, and a little more than six months after his own departure from Paris at the head of his brilliant army of six hundred and fifty thousand men, the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte returned to his capital, a fugitive, the first to escape of all that host now reduced to about twenty thousand wretched wanderers. With that energy which, combined with his intellect, made him the prodigy he was, the defeated hero set to work immediately to create another army great as the one which he had lost. But now he felt, more than he ever had before, the necessity of being on good terms with the Holy See. The health of the Holy Father, who was now seventy-one years of age, had been so impaired by sickness, the harsh treatment he had undergone, grief for the afflictions of the church, and his being deprived of the presence of all his trustworthy counsellors while he was constantly surrounded by the artful minions of his enemy, that his mind also became weakened to some extent and his strength of will remained no longer the same. When therefore the perfidious soldier came to visit him in his place of captivity, and unblushingly threw his arms around his neck and kissed his cheek, the loving-hearted pontiff forgot all the ill treatment he had received, accepted these demonstrations as symptoms of genuine affection, and gave undeserved confidence to the assurance and desire for sincere reconciliation of a man who

only sought to strengthen his political position by the subservient co-operation of the church. Various accounts are given us of the interviews between Napoleon and Pius VII. It appears that the royal executioner adapted alternately with his victim the system of caresses and abuse. Once he was on the point of striking him in the face. Finally the harassed Pontiff yielded to his adversary so far as to accept and sign his name to a compromise on the points that were debated; by so doing he hoped to escape from still greater concessions, but the compromise itself involved a sacrifice of church-principle. The Emperor, having obtained what he came in search of, went his way, and had it publicly proclaimed that a new concordat was agreed to by the Pope, and a perfect mutual good understanding existed between them both. No proclamation could have done more to sustain the waning popularity of the leader battling against adverse fortune. The Pope himself, however, who had here committed a grave fault—if a man no longer possessed of physical strength enough to be complete master of his reason was capable of committing a serious fault—so soon as the deed was done, fell into the profoundest melancholy, a state of remorse bordering on despair. But Pius had now drunk the last drop in the cup of humiliation by which God intended to perfect his sanctity. He fell, though under circumstances of the greatest extenuation for his fall, but it served him to give an example of sublime humility. Encouraged by his faithful friends and servants, the illustrious Cardinals Pacca and Consalvi, who were now allowed to return to his side, he rallied from his despondency, and on the 24th of March, wrote with his own hand a letter to the Emperor wherein he retracts and annuls all the imprudent concessions he had made. "In the presence of God," he writes, "to whom we shall soon be called to give an account, we acknowledge with grief and confusion that we should be using our authority, not to build up, but to destroy, had we the misfortune to execute what we imprudently promised, not, as God is our witness, with any evil intention, but through pure weakness, for we are but dust and ashes." Here is the priest! And who is the greater of the two, Napoleon Bonaparte, with all his genius, but with his want of principle, or Pius VII., worn and almost dying, humbling himself for an involuntary fault? But Bonaparte was the embodiment of that greatness which the world admires, Pius VII. was the realization of a sublimer ideal to which only the grace of God can give a living existence.

What vengeance the disappointed Emperor would have wrecked upon the courageous servants who had advised the Father of the faithful to this step, had victory enabled him to reestablish his power in Europe, we cannot tell. But his time was over. On the 23d of

January, 1814, Pius was obliged to depart from Fontainebleau for the south of France: on the 1st of April of the same year, Napoleon, beaten, no longer in Russia and in Germany, but in France itself, and obliged to retreat to the same oft mentioned Fontainebleau, and abandoned by all his friends, there heard of his dethronement by the very senate which he had created to sustain his uncertain power. Three days later he there signs his own abdication, and learns that he is to be banished and confined an exile and a captive himself on the isle of Elba. In half a year he leaves Elba, to invade France, so to say, all alone, but only to be beaten again at Waterloo and, after seven dreary years, to end his days, like a chained eagle, on the bleak crest of St. Helena, an island belonging to Great Britain off the coast of Africa.

Pius VII. returned to Rome. One of the first acts of this holy Pontiff on his restoration to the Apostolic throne was one which makes his memory very dear to every member of the order founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola. His predecessor, Clement XIV., forty-two years before, forced by the enemies of God to sacrifice one religious association in order to save the church from greater persecution, had suppressed the Society of Jesus. Pius VII., less than two months after his return to Rome, re-constituted it. By this act he intended to apply a remedy to some of the evils from which Christian society suffered, by resuscitating a body of men who devoted their lives to study, and who had for object to teach and preach sound doctrine in every way to every kind of people. The Society of Jesus had gone down into the grave by unjust persecution, like Him whose name it bore: so long as the spirit of the Heart of Jesus animates it, it will be forever grateful to the pope to whom it owes its resurrection.

Pius VII. lived till the year 1823, that is, till the age of ninety-one, and his reign was the longest reign of all the successors of St. Peter except the remarkable one of the venerated Pius IX., and the still more wonderful one of the present Leo XIII. After much suffering, he lived to see long days of peace. A few moments before he expired, an attendant addressed him by the title of "Your Holiness!" "What," he exclaimed, "Holiness? I am but a poor sinner." So died Pius VII., and who can doubt that he was a saint? Two years before him, Napoleon gave up his soul to his maker. He received the sacraments of the church with apparent joy, but, if he has obtained the one thing necessary for even the greatest genius, we may ascribe it without hesitation in great part to the prayers of the injured pontiff who, both before and after his death, recommended daily his poor soul to God.

But the vicissitudes of the Bonaparte family did not end with

Napoleon I. He had a nephew. This extraordinary character, after a strangely varied career, having apparently, for a considerable time, swayed the destinies of Europe, died thirty years ago in an obscure village in England, an exile. The sinister fate of Louis Napoleon recalled to Catholics the story of his uncle. For to *their* minds the one case threw light upon the other, the same causes or similar causes operated the same or similar effects in the case of both men; the same Divine providence which had raised both uncle and nephew to the sublimity of power, for the same reason and by similar ways, brought both nephew and uncle to destruction. No Roman Catholic hesitated to ascribe his misconduct towards the venerable head of the Catholic church as the reason why God hurled the first Napoleon from power, and sent him from his palace in Fontainebleau a reeling prisoner, first to Elba, and then to end his restless career on the rock of St. Helena amid the lone waves of the Atlantic Ocean. And when Louis Napoleon was taken from the fated city of Sedan first a prisoner to the fortress of Wilhelmshoe, and then went into banishment to die at Chiselhurst, no Roman Catholic failed to recognize that the hand of God had struck him too because he had been unfaithful to his trust as the head of a Catholic nation and had betrayed the Father of the faithful into the hands of his enemies. The political consequences of the second French emperor's treason to the Holy Father, to Pius IX., still continue in the present condition of things in Rome and Italy as well as France. Had Napoleon III. boldly and consistently declared himself a Catholic ruler, Catholic France was still strong enough to assure not only the perpetuity of his reign but also of his dynasty. But he seems to have adopted with a kind of family adoration all the ideas of his uncle as they were crudely formed in that great mind, only enveloping them in a robe of more mysterious duplicity. This man had read how, when the Papal power was considered definitely destroyed by the first French republic, the Cardinals were providentially enabled to meet in Venice on the demise of Pius VI. and elect his successor Pius VII. in all liberty. He had seen how his uncle, when he had consummated the measure of his iniquities, was struck by the hand of God with defeat, knocked from his throne, and Pius carried back triumphantly to Rome, and the Protestant nations of Europe insisting upon rendering him all honor as the first of temporal potentates. He knew that his uncle had had a son by his second wife, to whom he audaciously gave the title of king of Rome, and he knew what the fate of that child had been. Yet he abandoned the Holy Father, struck treacherously at his temporal power, and contributed to the formation of a kingdom of Italy built on robbery and blood. This half Christian half free-thinker, half prince half conspirator, had not read history

well. He too lost his empire, had his Elba in Wilhelmshoë and his St. Helena in Chiselhurst. He may not have been obliged to undergo the indignities to which his great uncle was subjected, but his humiliation was substantially the same. And so curious were the coincidences between the calamities which the French nation suffered on his account and the blows struck at the Holy See by the perfidious Italian government, that it is worth while to mention them. On the very day when the evacuation of Rome by the French troops was announced, the French army met its first repulse from the Germans at Wissenburg; on the day and at the hour when the French general at Rome embarked for France, it suffered its second and overwhelming defeat at Woerth. On the day when the last 4,000 French troops left the Papal States, 4,000 French prisoners fell into the hands of the Prussians. On the day when the Piedmontese seized Civita Vecchia, the Prussians entered Versailles. On the day when the Italians completed the investment of Rome, the Germans completed the investment of Paris. On the 23d of January, 1871, Prince, afterwards King, Humbert entered Rome to take up his residence at the Quirinal: on the same day Jules Favre went to Versailles to offer the capitulation of Paris. And on the 1st of February, when the Italian government declared the deposition of the Pope an accomplished fact, the army of Bourbaki, 80,000 strong, crossed the frontiers of Switzerland, and France lay crushed under the foot of her conqueror, an accomplished fact indeed. We need not add how, as the only son and child of the greater Napoleon died, the only son and child of Louis Napoleon perished too, in an obscure skirmish, by the hand of a savage, fighting for England, in South Africa.

With the Lord a thousand years are as a day, and a day as a thousand years. His arm is not shortened, and when He wills He can cause His enemies to disappear like mist before the wind. Will He interfere, when will He, how will He? Or will He let once Christian Europe lapse into the condition of the peoples of the East? We know not. The German race broke the unity of the church. The Latin race seems to be going further and sinking into infidelity, while the northern nations show signs of a return to the true religion. What we do know is that there will always exist the Roman Catholic Church, and that, when all the psuedo-dynasties and hastily constructed empires and so-called republics shall have passed away, there will be living a man the ruler over hundreds of millions of souls, because he is the vicar of Jesus Christ, the depository of all spiritual authority on earth. He may be dwelling in peace; he may be surrounded by ten thousand enemies. His subjects, who will be his children, will be scattered all over this globe. He will probably be an old man, weak in body, strong in mind, and acknowledgedly

the one only great man of his time. But he will never die, for he belongs to a line of kings which cannot perish, nor their kingdom; for it was to them and to him that Christ said: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against *thee*, for I shall be with *you* till the consummation of ages."

D. A. Merrick, S. J.

New York.

THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES.

LEO XIII.—FOR A PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

THE broad stretch of islands bounded by the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean which Philip II., King of Spain, called the Philippines, were scarcely opened up by Ferdinand Magellan at the beginning of the sixteenth century when, with the image of the Holy Cross planted on their shores, they were consecrated to God and offered as a first fruit offering of the Catholic religion.

From that time the Roman Pontiffs, with the aid of Charles V. and Philip his son, both remarkable for their zeal for spreading the faith, have thought nothing more urgent than to convert the islanders, who were idol worshippers, to the faith of Christ. With God's help, by the strenuous efforts of the members of different religious orders, this came about very favorably and in such a short time that Gregory XIII. decided to appoint a Bishop for the growing Church there, and constituted Manila an Episcopal See. With this happy beginning the growth which followed in after years corresponded in every way. Owing to the united measures of our predecessors and of the Spanish kings slavery was abolished, the inhabitants were trained in the ways of civilization by the study of arts and letters, so that the people and Church in the Philippines were deservedly distinguished by the renown of their nation and their meritorious zeal for religion. In this way, under the direction of the kings of Spain and the patronage of the Roman Pontiffs, Catholicity was maintained with due order in the Philippine Islands. But the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters there has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for every one rights which are safe and unassailable.

To provide against the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this new state of affairs a plan of action and of organization had to be sought promptly and with great care. For this purpose we sent our venerable Brother Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, as our Delegate Extraordinary to the Philippine Islands, who, after examining in person and putting to rights whatever would not admit of delay or postponement, was then to report to us. The duties thus imposed he has discharged faithfully in our behalf, and deserves for this reason that we should bestow on him well-merited praise. Later it happened auspiciously that the government of the United States of America undertook, by means of a special legation, to consider plans for a way of adjusting certain questions regarding Catholic interests in the Philippines. This enterprise we gladly encouraged, and by the skill and moderation of the negotiators a way has been opened for a settlement, which is to be effected on the ground itself. After hearing the opinions of some of the Holy Roman and Eminent Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation presiding over Extraordinary Affairs, we decree and declare in this Apostolical Constitution what has seemed, after long deliberation, to be most conducive for the interests of the Church in the Philippine Islands, trusting that what we, by our supreme authority ordain, may, with the civil government righteously and favorably disposed, be zealously and piously observed.

I.—ON THE NEW BOUNDARIES OF DIOCESES.

First of all, therefore, it is our intention and purpose to increase the sacred hierarchy. When the diocese of Manila had been created by Gregory XIII., as we have said, as the faithful rapidly increased in numbers, both by reason of the natives who embraced the Catholic religion and of the arrivals from Europe, Clement VIII. decided to increase the number of bishops. He therefore elevated the Church in Manila to the dignity of an Archiepiscopate, making the Bishops of the three new dioceses he created, Cebu, Caceres and Neo Segovia, suffragans to it. To these was added later in the year 1865, the Episcopal See of Jaro.

Now these dioceses are so vast that, owing to the distance by which the settlements are separated and the difficulties of travel, the bishops can scarcely visit them thoroughly without extreme labor. Wherefore it is necessary to avail ourselves of the present opportunity to reduce the dioceses already established to narrower limits, and to form new ones. Hence, keeping the archiepiscopal see of Manila, and the dioceses of Cebu, Caceres, Neo Segovia and Jaro, we add to them and create four new dioceses: Lipa, Tuguegarao,

Capiz and Zamboanga all, like the others, suffragan to the Manilan Metropolis. Moreover, in the Marian Islands, we create a Prefecture Apostolic subject, without any intermediate authority, to ourselves and to our successors.

II.—THE METROPOLITAN AND HIS SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.

The Archbishop of Manila is the one who will bear the title of "Metropolitan" in the Philippine Islands; and all the other bishops, those who fill the old as well as those who are to occupy the newly created sees, will be subject to him, as suffragans both in rank and in name. The rights and the functions of the Metropolitan are laid down by the ecclesiastical laws already extant. As we wish that these laws be inviolably observed, so also do we wish that the bonds of holy friendship and charity between the Metropolitan and his suffragans be ever unimpaired, and grow always closer and more binding by mutual services, exchange of counsel, and especially by frequent episcopal conventions, so far as distance may permit. Concord is the mother and guardian of the greatest benefits.

III.—THE METROPOLITAN AND SUFFRAGAN CHAPTERS.

The dignity and precedence of the Metropolitan Church require that it should be honored by a College of Canons. The Delegate Apostolic will see and determine how to obtain in future the stipend for each of the Canons which hitherto was paid by the Spanish government. If, owing to the shrinkage of revenue, the number of Canons cannot be maintained as heretofore, let it be reduced so as to consist of ten at least, and retain those who are Canons by right of their office. The Archbishop may by his own unrestricted right confer the aforementioned dignities, the Canonry, and all the benefices which belong to the Metropolitan Church; except, indeed, those which either by common law are reserved to the Apostolic See, or are the gift of some other person, or are controlled by the conditions of the concursus. We earnestly desire to have colleges of canons formed in the other cathedral churches also. Until such time as this can be done, the bishops are to choose for consultors some priests, secular and religious distinguished by their piety, learning and experience in administration, as is done in other dioceses in which there is no canonical chapter. To provide for the proper dignity of the sacred ceremonies, the consultors, just mentioned, should attend the bishop when officiating. If for any reason they be prevented from so doing, the bishop will substitute others, worthy members of the clergy, both secular and religious.

IV.—VACANT SUFFRAGAN SEES.

Should it happen that any suffragan diocese, in which there is no

canonical chapter, should lose its bishop, the Metropolitan will assume its administration; should there be none, the charge will fall to the nearest bishop, with the condition, however, that a vicar be chosen as soon as possible. Meanwhile the vicar general of the deceased bishop will manage the diocese.

V.—THE SECULAR CLERGY.

Since it is proved by experience that a native clergy is most useful everywhere, the bishops must make it their care to increase the number of native priests, in such a manner, however, as to form them thoroughly in piety and character, and to make sure that they are worthy to be entrusted with ecclesiastical charges.

Let them gradually appoint to the more responsible positions those whom practical experience will prove to be more efficient. Above all things the clergy should hold to the rule that they are not to allow themselves to be mixed up in party strifes. Although it is a maxim of common law that he who fights for God should not be involved in worldly pursuits, we deem it necessary that men in holy orders in the present condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands should avoid this in a special manner. Moreover, since there is great power in harmony of sentiment for accomplishing every great useful work for the sake of religion, let all the priests, whether secular or religious, cultivate it most zealously. It is certainly proper that they who are one body of the one head Christ should not envy one another, but be of one will, loving one another with brotherly charity. To foster this charity and maintain a vigorous discipline the bishops are reminded how very useful it is to convene a synod occasionally as time and place may require. In this way there will easily be unity in thought and action. To keep the first fervor of the priests from cooling and to preserve and increase the virtues which are worthy of the priesthood, the practice of the spiritual exercises is most helpful. The bishops must therefore see that all who have been called to the vineyard of the Lord should at least every third year go into retreat in some suitable place to meditate on the eternal truths, to remove the stains contracted by worldly contamination and renew their ecclesiastical spirit. Effort must be made to have the study of the sacred sciences kept alive among the clergy by frequent exercise: "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge," by which he can teach the faithful, "who shall seek the law at his mouth."* For this purpose there is nothing better than to have conferences frequently, both on moral and on liturgical questions. If the difficulties of traveling, or the small number of priests, or any other similar cause prevents them from meeting for

* Malachy ii., 7.

such discussions, it will be well to have those who cannot attend the conferences treat in writing the questions proposed and submit them to the bishop at the appointed time.

VI.—THE SEMINARIES.

How much the Church thinks of seminaries for the young men who are educated with a view to the priesthood, is clear from the decree of the Council of Trent, by which they were first instituted. The bishops should therefore make the most diligent effort to have one in each diocese, in which young candidates for the sacred warfare may be received and trained for a holy living and in the lower and higher sciences. It is advisable that the boys who are studying literature should occupy their own building, and the young men who, after finishing the humanities, are devoted to philosophy and theology should dwell in another. In both departments the students should remain until, if deserving, they shall have been ordained priests, and never be permitted, except for grave reasons, to return to their homes. The bishop will entrust the administration of the seminary to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his prudence and experience in governing, and for holiness of life. The rules laid down by us and by our predecessors show very clearly in what way the studies are to be regulated in seminaries. Where there is no seminary the bishop will have candidates educated in one of the seminaries of the neighboring diocese. On no account should the bishops admit to these seminaries any but the young men who are likely to give themselves to God in holy orders. Those who wish to study for the civil professions should have other schools, if it be possible, known as episcopal institutions or colleges. Above all things the bishop, following the precept of the Apostle, is not lightly to lay hands on any one; but to raise to orders and to employ in sacred things only those who when well tried and duly advanced in science and virtue can be of credit and of service to a diocese. They are not to leave those who go out from the seminary entirely to themselves; but to keep them from idleness and from abandoning the study of the sacred sciences, it is an excellent thing to have them every year for at least five years after ordination submit to an examination in dogmatic and moral theology before men of learning and authority. Since the halls of Rome also are open to young students from the Philippines who may wish to pursue the higher studies, it will afford us much pleasure if the bishops send hither from time to time young men who may one day communicate to their fellow citizens the knowledge of religion acquired in this very centre of truth. This Holy See will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in

higher learning and better ecclesiastical training, so that in good time it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

VII.—THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF YOUTH AND THE MANILA UNIVERSITY.

It is not to the ecclesiastical seminaries only that the bishops are to devote their attention, the young laymen who go to other schools are also committed to their care and providence. It is therefore the duty of the consecrated bishops to make every effort that the minds of the young who are instructed in the public schools should not lack knowledge of their religion. To have it taught properly, the bishops must see and insist that the teachers are fitted for this task and that the books in use contain no errors. Since there is question of public schools, we do not wish to proceed without a word of praise well deserved for the great Lyceum of Manila, founded by the Dominicans, and authorized by Innocent X. Since it has always been distinguished for sound doctrine and excellent teachers, for the great good it has accomplished, not only do we wish that it be treated with favor by all the bishops, but besides we take it under our own care and that of our successors. Wherefore confirming absolutely the privileges and honors granted to it by the Roman Pontiffs Innocent X. and Clement XII., we bestow upon it the title of Pontifical University and wish that the academic degrees conferred by it may have the same value as the degrees given by other Pontifical Universities.

VIII.—THE REGULARS.

Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity and peaceful social intercourse. We recommend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offense to any man." We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish therefore that all should be bound by the decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII. our predecessor confirmed by Apostolic Letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI. by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith,

August 24, 1780. For the rest, the Religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God: and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in future in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Formandis* of Benedict XII., dated November 6, 1744, and the other *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

IX.—THE PARISHES.

The bishops will determine what parishes are to be entrusted to pastors from the Religious Orders after conferring with the superiors of these orders. Should any question arise in this matter which cannot be settled privately the case is to be referred to the Delegate Apostolic.

X.—THE MISSIONS.

To the other means, by which the Church as teacher provides that faith and good morals and all that makes for the salvation of souls should suffer no harm must be added one of the very greatest utility, the spiritual exercises commonly known as missions. It is altogether desirable, therefore, that in each province at least one house be founded, as a dwelling for about eight religious men, whose one duty it will be to visit occasionally the towns and villages and better the people by pious exhortations. If this is so useful for the faithful, it is surely necessary for those who have not yet received the light of the Gospel. Wherever, therefore, uncivilized peoples are still buried in monstrous idolatry, the bishops and priests must know that they are bound to try to convert them. Let them, therefore, establish stations among them for priests who will act as their apostles, and not only lead the idolaters to Christian practices, but also devote themselves to the instruction of the children. These stations are to be so located that in due time they may be made Prefectures or Vicariates Apostolic. To provide those who labor in them with means for support and for the propagation of the faith, we recommend that in each diocese, without interfering with the Lyons Society for the Propagation of the Faith, special congregations of men and women be formed to manage the collection of the

alms of the faithful and hand over the contributions to the bishops, to be distributed entirely and equally to the missions.

XI.—ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.

To win the esteem of the faithful there is no better way than for the clergy to do in effect what as priests they preach. For, since, as the Council of Trent says, they are regarded as removed above worldly things to a higher plane, others lift their eyes to them for a model and imitate what they get from them. Wherefore it is highly

proper that priests should so regulate all their manners that in their dress, carriage, walk, conversation, and in all things they may appear grave, moderate and altogether religious; they should avoid even lighter faults, which in them are serious, so that all their actions may inspire veneration. It is for this restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and for the full execution of this Constitution we have sent our Venerable Brother John Baptist Guidi, Archbishop of Stauropolis, as Extraordinary Delegate Apostolic to the Philippine Islands, carrying thither our person. In him we have conferred all necessary faculties; and we have given him besides our mandate to convene and hold a provincial Synod, as soon as circumstances permit.

XII.—ON PEACE AND REVERENCE FOR THOSE IN AUTHORITY.

It remains for us now only to address ourselves with paternal charity to all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, and to exhort them with all the persuasion in our power to maintain union in the bonds of peace. This the duty of our Christian profession requires: "For greater is the brotherhood in Christ, than of blood: for the brotherhood of blood means only a likeness of body, but brotherhood in Christ is unanimity in heart and in soul, as it is written in Acts iv., 32, 'and the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.'" This, too, is required for the good of religion, which is the chief source and ground of the praiseworthy things which have distinguished the Philippine peoples in the past. This, finally, is required by a sincere love of country, which will derive nothing but loss and destruction from public disturbances. Let them reverence those who exercise authority, according to the Apostle, "for all power is from God." And although separated from us by the broad expanse of ocean, let them know that they are one in faith with the Apostolic See, which embraces them with special affection and will never abandon its charge of protecting their interests.

[Here follow the usual affirmation of the validity of this Constitution, and the penalties for disobeying or opposing it.]

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

FROM the beginning of our Pontificate having gravely considered the serious conditions of society, we are not slow to recognize, as one of the most urgent duties of the Apostolic office, that of devoting a most special care to the education of the clergy.

We see in fact that all our designs to bring about a restoration of Christian life among our people, would be in vain if in the ecclesiastical state the sacerdotal spirit was not preserved intact and vigorous. This we have not ceased to do, as far as was possible to us, both with institutions and writings directed to that end. And now a particular solicitude regarding the clergy of Italy moves us, venerable brethren, again to treat on this subject of so great importance. It is true, beautiful and continued testimonies have been shown of learning, piety and zeal, among which we are glad to praise the alacrity with which, seconding the impulse and direction of their bishops, they coöperate in that Catholic movement which we have so much at heart. We cannot altogether, however, hide the preoccupation of our soul at seeing for some time past a certain desire of innovation insinuating itself here and there, as regards the constitution as well as the multiform actions of the sacred ministry. Now it is easy to foresee the grave consequences which we should have to deplore if a speedy remedy were not applied to this innovating tendency.

Therefore, in order to preserve the Italian clergy from the pernicious influences of the times, we deem it opportune, venerable brethren, to recall in this our letter, the true and invariable principles that should regulate ecclesiastical education and the entire sacred ministry. The Catholic priesthood—divine in its origin, supernatural in its essence, immutable in its character, is not an institution that can accommodate itself with ease to human systems and opinions. A participation of the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ, it must perpetuate even to the consummation of ages the same mission that the Eternal Father confided to His Incarnate Word: "Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos." To work the eternal salvation of souls will always be the great commandment of

which it must never fall short, as to faithfully fulfil it, it must never cease to have recourse to those supernatural aids and those divine rules of thought and of action which Jesus Christ gave His Apostles when He sent them throughout the whole world to convert the nations to the Gospel. Therefore St. Paul in his letters reminds us that the priest can never be anything but the legate, the minister of Christ, the dispenser of His mysteries, and he represents him to us as dwelling in a high place, as a mediator between heaven and earth, to treat with God, about the supreme interests of the human race, which are those of everlasting life. The idea that holy books give us of the Christian priesthood, is that it is a supernatural institution superior to all those of earth, and as far separated from them as the divine is from the human.

This same high idea is clearly brought out by the works of the Fathers, the laws of the Roman Pontiffs, and the Bishops, by the decrees of the Councils, and by the unanimous teaching of the Doctors and of the Catholic schools. Above all, the tradition of the Church with one voice proclaims that the priest is another Christ, and that the priesthood though exercised on earth merits to be numbered among the orders of heaven; because it is given to them to administer things that are wholly celestial and upon them is conferred a power that God has not trusted even to the angels; a power and ministry which regard the government of souls, and which is the art of arts. Therefore, education, studies, customs, and whatever comprises the sacerdotal discipline have always been considered by the Church as belonging entirely to herself, not merely distinct, but altogether separate from the ordinary rules of secular life. This distinction and separation must, therefore, remain unaltered, even in our own times, and any tendency to accommodate or confound the ecclesiastical life and education with the secular life and education must be considered as reproved, not only by the traditions of Christian ages, but by the apostolic doctrine itself and the ordinances of Jesus Christ.

Certainly in the formation of the clergy and the sacerdotal ministry, it is reasonable that regard should be had to the varied conditions of the times. Therefore we are far from rejecting the idea of such changes as would render the work of the clergy still more efficacious in the society in which they live, and it is for that reason that it has seemed necessary to us to promote among them a more solid and finished culture, and to open a still wider field to their ministry; but every other innovation which could in any way prejudice what is essential to the priest must be regarded as altogether blameworthy. The priest is above all constituted master, physician and shepherd of souls, and a guide to an end not enclosed within the

bounds of this present life. Now he can never fully correspond if he is not well versed in the science of divine and sacred things, if he is not furnished with that piety which makes a man of God; and if he does not take every care to render his teachings valuable by the efficacy of his example, conformably to the admonition given to the sacred pastor by the Prince of the Apostles: "Forma facti gregis ex animo." For those who watch the times and the changeable condition of society, these are the right and the greatest gifts that could shine in the Catholic priest, together with the principles of faith; every other quality natural and human would certainly be commendable, but would not have with regard to the sacerdotal office anything but secondary and relative importance. If, therefore, it is reasonable and just that the clergy should accommodate themselves as far as is permitted to the needs of the present age, it is still more necessary that the present depravity of the century should not be yielded to, but strongly resisted; and this while corresponding naturally to the high end of the priesthood, will also render their ministry still more fruitful by increasing its dignity, and therefore gaining it respect. It is seen everywhere how the spirit of naturalism tends to penetrate every part of the social body, even the most healthy; a spirit which fills the minds with pride and causes them to rebel against every authority; depraves the heart and turns it after the desire of earthly goods, neglecting those eternal.

It is greatly to be feared that some influence of this spirit, so evil, and already so widely diffused, might insinuate itself even among ecclesiastics, particularly among those of less experience. What sad effects would not arise if that gravity of conduct which belongs to the priest, should be in any way lessened; if he should yield with lightness to the charm of every novelty; if he should deport himself with pretentious indocility towards his superiors; if he should lose that weight and measure in discussion which is so necessary, particularly in matters of faith and morals.

Would it not be a still more deplorable thing, causing as it would the ruin of Christian people, if he, in the sacred ministry of the pulpit, should introduce language not comformable to his character of a preacher of the Gospel? Moved by such considerations we feel it our duty again and still more warningly to recommend that above all things the Seminaries should with jealous care keep up a proper spirit with regard to the education of the mind as well as to that of the heart. They must never lose sight of the fact that they are exclusively destined to prepare young men not for merely human offices, however praiseworthy and honorable, but for that higher mission, which we lately spoke of, as ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God. From such a reflection altogether

supernatural, it will be easy, as we have already said in our Encyclical to the clergy of France, dated September 8, 1899, to draw precious rules, not merely for the correct education of clerics, but also to remove far from the institutes in which they are educated, every danger, whether external or internal, or of a moral or religious order.

With respect to the studies, in order that the clergy should not be strangers to the advancement of all good discipline, everything that is truly useful or good will be recognized in the new methods; every age can contribute to the knowledge of human learning. However, we desire that on this subject, great attention shall be paid to our prescriptions regarding the study of classic literature, principally philosophy, theology, and the like sciences—prescriptions which we have given in many writings, chiefly in the above-mentioned Encyclical, of which we send you an extract, together with the present. It would certainly be desirable that the young ecclesiastics should all follow the course of studies always under the shadow of the sacred institutes. However, as grave reasons sometimes render it necessary that some of them should frequent the public universities, let it not be forgotten with what and how great caution bishops should permit this.

We desire likewise that they should insist on the faithful observance of the rules contained in a still more recent document, which in a particular manner regards the lectures on anything else that could give occasion to the young men to take part in external agitations. Thus the students of the seminaries, treasuring up this time, so precious and full of the greatest tranquillity for their souls, will be able to devote themselves entirely to those studies which will render them fitted for the grand duties of the priesthood, particularly that of the ministry of preaching and the confessional. They should reflect well on the gravity of the responsibilities of those priests who in spite of the great need of the Christian people neglect to devote themselves to the exercise of the sacred ministry, and of those also who, not bringing to it an enlightened zeal for both the one and the other, correspond sadly with their vocation in things which are of the greatest importance in the salvation of souls.

Here we must call your attention, venerable brethren, to the special instruction which we wish given regarding the ministry of the Divine Word; and from which we desire they should draw copious fruit. With respect to the ministry of the confession: let them remember how severe are the words of the most enlightened and mildest of moralists towards those who, without purifying their own souls, do not hesitate to seat themselves in the tribunal of Penance, and how not less severe is the lament of the late great Pontiff, Benedict XIV., who numbers among the greatest calamities of the Church

the defect in confessors of a science, both theological and moral, added to the gravity that such a holy office requires.

To the noble end of preparing worthy ministers of the Lord, it is necessary, venerable brethren, to watch with an ever-increasing vigor and vigilance not only over the scientific instruction, but also over the disciplinary and educative systems of your seminaries. Do not accept young men other than those who exhibit well-founded desires of consecrating themselves for ever to the ecclesiastical ministry. Keep them removed from contact and still more from living together with youths who are not aspiring to the sacred ministry. Such intercourse may, for certain just and grave reasons, be allowed for a time, and with great caution, until they can be properly provided for according to the spirit of ecclesiastical discipline. Those who during the course of their education shall manifest tendencies little suited to the priestly vocation, must be dismissed, and in admitting clerics to the sacred orders the utmost discretion must be used, according to the grave admonition of St. Paul to Timothy, "Manus cito nemini imposueris." In this matter it is only right that every consideration should be put on one side that is inferior to the most important one of the dignity of the sacred ministry. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that in order to render the pupils of the sanctuary living images of Jesus Christ (which is the end of ecclesiastical education), that the directors and teachers should unite to the diligent fulfilment of their office the example of a truly priestly life. The exemplary conduct of those in authority is, especially to young men, the most eloquent and persuasive language to inspire in their souls the conviction of their own duties and the love of virtue.

A work of such importance requires from the directors of souls a more than ordinary prudence and an indefatigable care; and it is our desire that this office, which we wish should not be lacking in any seminary, should be confided to an ecclesiastic of great experience in the ways of Christian perfection. It can never be sufficiently recommended to him to found and cultivate in his pupils that piety which is for all, but especially for the clergy, of the greatest fruitfulness and inestimable utility. Therefore, he will be solicitous to warn them against a pernicious snare not unfrequent among young men —that of giving themselves so entirely and with such ardor to their studies as to neglect their advancement in the science of the saints. The deeper root piety has taken in clerics' souls, so much the more will they be filled with that strong spirit of sacrifice which is altogether necessary to work for the divine glory in the salvation of souls. Thanks be to God, there are not lacking among the Italian clergy priests who give noble proof of what a minister of God, pene-

trated with that spirit, can do; wonderful, indeed, is the generosity of many who to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ voluntarily hasten to distant countries, there to encounter fatigues, privations and hardships of every kind and even martyrdom itself.

In this manner, aided by loving care and fitting culture of soul and mind, step by step the young Levite will be brought up to recognize both the sanctity of his vocation and the needs of the Christian people. The training, 'tis true, is not short; and yet it is to be wished that the time in the seminary could be prolonged. It is necessary, indeed, that the young priests are not left without guidance in their first labors, but should be strengthened by the experience of their seniors, who will ripen their zeal, their prudence and their piety; and it is expedient also that either with academic exercises or with periodical conferences they should be encouraged to continue with their sacred studies.

It is plain, venerable brethren, that what we have here recommended will aid in a singular manner that social usefulness of the clergy which we have on many occasions inculcated as necessary to our times. Therefore, by exacting the faithful observance of those rules this usefulness will draw therefrom its spirit and life.

We repeat again, and still more warmly, that the clergy go to a Christian people tempted on every side, and with every kind of fallacious promise offered by Socialism to apostatize from the true faith. They must therefore submit all their actions to the authority of those whom the Holy Spirit has constituted Bishops, to rule the Church of God, without which would follow confusion and the most grave disorders to the detriment even of the cause they have at heart to defend and promote. It is for this end that we desire that the candidates for the priesthood, on the conclusion of their education in the seminary, should be suitably instructed in the pontifical documents relating to the social question, and the Christian democracy, abstaining, however, as we have already said, from taking any part whatever in the external movement. When they are made priests they will direct themselves with particular care to the people, always the object of the Church's loving care. They will raise the children of the people from the ignorance of things both spiritual and eternal, and with industrious tenderness they will lead them to an honest and virtuous life. They will strengthen the adults in their faith, dissipating the contrary prejudices and confirm them in the practices of Christian life. They will promote among the Catholic laity those institutions which they will recognize as really efficacious in the moral and material improvement of the multitude. Above all they will propose to them the principles of justice and evangelical charity, to which are equally united all the rights and duties of civil and social

life, such should be the way in which they fulfil their noble part in the social action.

Let them, however, have it always present to their minds that the priest even in the midst of his people must preserve intact his august character as a minister of God, being as he is placed at the head of his brethren. Any manner whatever, in which he employs himself among the people, to the loss of the sacerdotal dignity, or with danger to the ecclesiastical duties and discipline, can only be warmly reproved.

This, then, venerable brethren, is what the conscience of the Apostolic Office has imposed on us to make known, regarding the present condition of the Italian clergy. We do not doubt that in a thing of such gravity and importance you will add your zealous and loving care to our solicitude, inspired thereto especially by the bright example of the great Archbishop, St. Charles Borromeo. Therefore, to give effect to our admonitions, make them the subject of your diocesan conferences, and inform yourselves on such means as are necessary according to the needs of your respective dioceses. To all these designs and deliberations you will not lack the aid of our authority.

And now, with words that rise from the depths of our fatherly heart, we turn to you, priests of Italy, and recommend to each and all of you to use every effort to correspond still more worthily with your high vocation. To you, ministers of Christ, we can say with more reason than did St. Paul to the mere faithful, "Obsecro itaque vos ego vinctus in Domino, ut digne ambuletis vocatione qua vocati estis." The love of our common mother the Church renews and reinvigorates between you that concord of thought and action which redoubles the strength and renders the work more fruitful. In these times, so dangerous to religion and society, when the clergy of every nation are called on to unite together in defense of the Faith and Christian morals, it belongs to you, beloved sons, joined by a special bond to this Apostolic See, to give to all an example and be the first in unlimited obedience to the voice and command of the Vicar of Jesus Christ; and so may the blessing of God which we invoke descend copiously and preserve the Italian clergy ever worthy of their illustrious traditions.

May the Apostolic Benediction be a pledge of the divine favor which, with the affection of our heart, we impart to you and to the entire clergy trusted to your care.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the Sacred day of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, December 8, 1902, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

LEO, P.P., XIII.

PAPAL ALLOCUTION ON CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

(Addressed to the Cardinals on December 23, 1902.)

WE shall not employ many words, Venerable Brethren, to express our gratitude for the devoted sentiments uttered in the name of all by the revered Cardinal, the Dean of your College. But this we cannot leave unsaid, that to-day more than ever, we repose our confidence in your united devotedness. Well-deserving coöperators for so long a time, you accompany us still with strenuous affection, even though the roughness of the road be increasing.

This year of Jubilee, the occasion of your courteous congratulations and of the unceasing demonstrations of love of the whole Christian world, is passing, as you see, embittered by social events, altogether too sorrowful for the heart of a Pontiff. The cause of the Church and of the Christian Name having been thwarted in a hundred ways, there is now a bolder attempt, to undermine, under the pretext of law, the sacred institutions of Christianity. But are not those a portion, and the choicest, of the heritage left by Christ to the nations redeemed, and ordained expressly for the guardianship and ward of the sovereign benefits of morality, the chief source of all other benefits to human society? False is the desire of public prosperity and of civil development, which inspires the doers of deeds like these! What is intended and sought is, in truth, the ruin of the Christian order of society and the reconstruction of States on the basis of a pagan naturalism. If it be written in heaven that amid such sorrows our day of life must end, we shall close our weary eyes in resignation, blessing God; but with this conviction planted most firmly in our heart, that, when the hour of mercy shall have come, He Himself will arise for the healing of the nations, assigned as an inheritance to the Only-Begotten of God.

Your last words allude, Lord Cardinal, to the social action of Christian Democracy, which has become to-day, as you fully understand, a fact of no slight importance. To this action, so entirely consonant to the spirit of our time and to the needs which called it forth, we gave sanction and impulse, defining clearly and distinctively its scope, its method, and its limitations; so that, if in this regard any one make a mistake, he cannot allege as an excuse that our authoritative guidance was wanting. But speaking in general of those who have become engaged in this work, Italians as well as others, it is undeniable that they labor therein with excellent zeal and notable results: nor may we allow to pass unnoticed the active

part that hundreds of noble-hearted young men have taken in it. We have encouraged the clergy also to enter this same field of action; for, in truth, there is no enterprise of sincere charity, judicious and beneficial, which is foreign to the vocation of the Catholic priesthood. And is not this true and most opportune charity, to apply oneself with care and disinterestedness to the betterment of the spiritual condition as well as the material circumstances of the multitude? The maternal love of the Church for mankind is as wide as the paternity of God; but, nevertheless, faithful to her origin, and mindful of the Divine example, she has been always accustomed to devote herself by predilection to the lowly, to the afflicted, to the disinherited of fortune. When it is sincerely and constantly animated by the spirit of this universal mother of peoples, Christian Democracy need have no fear of failing in its scope; nor need any one have fear of the name when he knows that the thing is good. Understood as the Church understands it, the democratic concept not only accords marvelously with the dictates of revelation and religious belief, but has even been born of Christianity and educated by it, and it is by the preaching of the Gospel that the nations have received it. Athens and Rome knew it not, before they heard the Divine Voice which said to men, "You are all brothers, and of one Father who is in heaven."

Outside of this democracy, which is called and which is Christian, there is a seditious and Godless democracy, which pursues other ideals and walks by other ways; and bitter are the days which it is preparing for the States which hatch it in their bosoms and caress it. But our popular Christian movement, extending itself to the same objects, is an antagonistic force which bars the way of success for the other, and is frequently able to anticipate its work. If our Christian movement does nothing more than contest the field with socialistic democracy, and circumscribe the pernicious influences of this latter, it will have rendered a service, by no means unimportant, to social order and Christian polity.

In affectionate exchange of good wishes, we implore from heaven the choicest blessings on the Sacred College, and of them may this be an omen which with warmth of heart we impart to you, extending it to the Bishops, to the various Prelates, and to all others who are gathered about us.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE ABSOLUTE ZERO.

According to the kinetic theory of matter, which is at present universally accepted by physicists, the molecule, which is the unit mass of matter with which the physicist deals, is in a state of motion and its energy, usually termed heat, is the molecular energy, due to this small mass of matter in virtue of its motion. According to this theory the expansion of a mass of matter is due to the fact that the path of vibration of these molecules is enlarged, that is, their energy is increased by increasing their velocity, contraction is due to the shortening of the path of vibration, which means the cooling ot the body.

The kinetic theory, moreover, explains the pressure of gases on the walls of containing vessels by stating that the pressure is due to the impact of these vibrating molecules on the sides of the vessel. It is a bombardment of the small molecules which is so rapid as to produce a continuous pressure on the containing walls. This pressure is increased with an increase of temperature and reduced with a reduction in temperature. The force of this pressure is dependent on the increase of volume of the gas. By accurate measurements it has been determined that a gas expands or contracts for an increase or decrease of one degree of temperature the one-two-hundred and seventy-third part of its volume. So that if we started with a gas at zero temperature and could cool it to minus 273 degrees centigrade the motion of the molecules would cease, that is there would be no heat in it.

We have never reached this temperature, and it is one of the problems of science whether we shall ever be able to reach it and determine the behavior of matter at this absolute zero temperature. One of the most successful workers in this field of investigation is Professor Dewar, who, in his presidential address at the Belfast meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, gave a summary of the present condition of scientific research in the production of very low temperatures. The great problem to be solved in the reaching of very low temperatures is not so much the cooling as the preserving the low temperature when obtained, that is, the preventing the influx of heat from surrounding bodies.

Professor Dewar solved this problem himself. He kept the liquefied gases in vessels with double walls and the annular space

between the walls was very highly exhausted. A coating of silver on the inner walls also reduced the influx of heat.

A further step was made by the counter-current apparatus of Linde, thus uniting to mechanical compression the cooling action of an expanding gas. This made liquid air possible and using liquid air as a new refrigerating agent an attack was made on hydrogen which was liquefied by Dewar in 1898. Thus Professor Dewar speaks of liquid hydrogen: "Liquid hydrogen is a colorless transparent body of extraordinary intrinsic interest. It has a clearly defined surface, is easily seen, drops well, in spite of the fact that its surface tension is only the thirty-fifth part of that of water, or about one-fifth that of liquid air, and can be poured easily from vessel to vessel. The liquid does not conduct electricity, and, if anything, is slightly diamagnetic. Compared with an equal volume of liquid air, it requires only one-fifth the quantity of heat for vaporization; on the other hand, its specific heat is ten times that of liquid air or five times that of water.

"It is by far the lightest liquid known to exist, its density being only one-fourteenth that of water; the lightest liquid previously known was liquid marsh gas, which is six times heavier. The only solid which has so small density as to float upon its surface is a piece of pith wood. It is by far the coolest liquid known. At ordinary atmospheric pressure it boils at minus 252.5 degrees or 20.5 degrees absolute. The vapor of the hydrogen arising from the liquid has nearly the density of air—that is, it is fourteen times that of the gas at the ordinary temperature. Reduction of the pressure by an air pump brings down the temperature to minus 258 degrees, when the liquid becomes a solid resembling frozen foam, and this by further exhaustion is cooled to minus 260 degrees or 13 degrees absolute, which is the lowest steady temperature that has been reached. The solid may also be got in the form of a clear transparent ice, melting at about 15 degrees absolute, under a pressure of 55 mm., possessing the unique density of one-eleventh that of water. Such cold involves the solidification of every gaseous substance but one that is at present definitely known to the chemist, and so liquid hydrogen introduces the investigator to a world of solid bodies."

If any further advance is to be made towards the absolute zero it can only be done by finding some gas that is more volatile than hydrogen, and such a gas is helium. This gas has not yet been liquefied, but it may be, and if so, the temperature of liquefaction will be lower than that of hydrogen. A sufficiently low temperature may be reached by use of liquid hydrogen, but if not it will undoubtedly be secured by the additional expediture of mechanical energy absorbing heat by the performance of external work. In

any event it is probable that there exist gases other than helium of greater volatility than hydrogen; and it is extremely improbable, in the opinion of Professor Dewar, that the absolute zero will ever be reached by man.

Although these investigations in quest of low temperatures are confined to the laboratory, the same was one day true of the researches of Faraday in electricity and magnetism, and to-day they form the foundation of the whole of modern electrical engineering.

BUREAU OF FORESTRY.

The Division of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture has been raised to the rank of a regular Government Bureau. The importance of this step will be fully appreciated when we recall the rate at which our wooded lands are being depleted and the consequent necessity of preserving and if possible increasing their extent.

A thorough study of the timber question reveals the fact that the annual natural income of timber does not equal the output and that we are daily drawing on the surplus of the past. This becomes a serious question when we consider not only the effect on the climate, the rainfall and the floods that result, but also when we consider the effect on home industry and foreign trade. One item alone will bring to our minds the enormous consumption of wood. Our newspapers, magazines and books are printed on paper made from wood pulp, and acres of virgin woodland are required for a single issue of a metropolitan daily or a leading magazine. Our exports are growing, and manufactured articles that require wood form a large part of them. Lumber is sent across the Atlantic in shiploads, our paper goes to Europe and Australia by millions of pounds, American carriages and furniture are largely used in Europe, our railway and trolley cars are purchased in South America, New Zealand and in Asia, and American wood and pulp manufactures are used the world over. Add to this American agricultural machinery which is in universal demand and we can form some idea of the rate at which our forests are being depleted.

The fact that the country is awake to the problem that confronts it is clear from the response that was universally given to the offer made by the Division of Forestry in 1898. This was an offer of expert services to advise and make plans for the management of woodlands. The response came from every State and Territory in the country and summed up embraced an area of 3,500,000 acres.

Another hopeful feature is recognized in the specific trend of American industrial life. The large corporations in every department of industry are producing not only the finished product but also the raw material, and thereby cheapening the cost of production. This same tendency is seen among paper manufacturers who are large consumers of wood. If they deplete the forest from which they take the wood they must move their mill, which means a large money loss. They are therefore obliged to take care of their woodlands that they may have a constant supply of wood for their paper pulp. So interested have some of these firms become in the preservation of the woods that although they control thousands of acres of forest they will not fell a tree that is under a foot in diameter, thus enabling them to use their pulp mill and forest indefinitely. They moreover employ skilled foresters to care for the trees.

Among the large consumers of timber must be reckoned the railroads. They require the wood for ties and telegraph poles, and as no satisfactory substitute has been found for wood as a railroad tie its increasing price is forcing the railroad companies to become practical timber growers, and in recent meetings of railroad managers there have been earnest discussions on the advisability of regular tree planting and cultivation on land secured for that purpose. This action by these companies opens up a field for trained foresters. The manufacturers of agricultural implements are adopting the same policy and some already have large tracts of woodland skillfully managed under advice received from the Division of Forestry.

The lumber companies are slower to adopt the scientific plan of staying by one tract of forest land and caring for it; still there is a gain in this direction, for in the Adirondacks, for example, it has been found profitable to adopt the advice of the Bureau and cut only trees above a certain size and to so do the work that the younger growth is not injured. Measures are also taken to guard against forest fires. Thus the forest is preserved for a steady yield for hundreds of years.

The Government of the United States has forest reserves amounting to about fifty millions of acres. To care for these government reserves and for the large woodland tracts controlled by corporations men skilled in forestry are required, and it has been the aim of the Bureau of Forestry to encourage in our colleges courses that will fit competent men to undertake this work in an intelligent way, and while making a good livelihood, protect and develop this important source of many industries in the country. At present there are forest schools in Yale, Cornell, Biltmore, N. C., and in many of the universities of the Middle West. The importance of this work cannot be overestimated, and now that it is being put on a scientific

basis we can look forward to the preservation of our forests that means so much for the material development of the nation.

INTERNAL COMBUSTION MOTORS.

Although we have internal combustion motors of different types, still there is a field for one requiring little or no water and burning a heavy oil. This fact was brought out in trials of military automobiles made by a committee of the British War Office. The experience that the army met with in South Africa proved the necessity of providing some power other than animal to haul supplies and arms over long distances. Machines propelled by steam were most numerous among those tested. Steam means a waste of fuel and demands a supply of water. The same difficulties that are encountered in animal haulage would also be met with in this method. Again, the supply of fuel would have to be hauled, and this would absorb too high a percentage of the capacity of this kind of motive power to make it practical. Hence an internal combustion engine requiring no water and burning heavy oil is recommended. The light oils are considered too dangerous on account of their volatility.

Another field for such motors is suggested by the recent successful trials of the two new submarine torpedo boats, the "Moccasin" and the "Adder," built for the United States Navy. What seems to be clearly proved by these tests is that there has been a decided gain in the control of the boat while it was submerged, and hence that in this direction the question of submarine navigation is solved. There remains, however, the question of motive power. Along this line the further advance in the torpedo boat will certainly be made. The present submarines use gasoline engines for motive power when running on the surface and for charging the storage batteries. In this arrangement there are two sources of danger, one from the fuel employed in the engine and the other from the gases that are liberated from the lead type of storage battery employed. An internal combustion motor burning a heavy oil would obviate the first difficulty, while the use of a storage battery of the Edison type, from which no gas arises, would correct the other. While the principal use of the submarine boat in this country will undoubtedly be in the line of harbor and coast defense, its field will be enlarged to that of a means of attack in European countries where the coasts are not so far apart. The field of the internal combustion motor is correspondingly increased and will no doubt stimulate the inventors to attack the problem of such a motor burning heavy oil.

The smoke question which is attracting so much attention also suggests a field for a motor such as we speak of. The solution of this question means the purification of the atmosphere, and the only feasible way of doing it is by preventing the pollution of the atmosphere. Hundreds of tons of solid refuse are daily projected into the atmosphere of some of our large cities where soft coal is used, and may be seen in the dense black columns of coal dust that rise from the chimneys. The prohibition of the use of soft coal in large cities is not practical on account of the limited supply of smokeless anthracite. Smoke consumers, while they have brought some little alleviation, are not a remedy. The direction then in which we are to look for a cure is the internal combustion engine. Engines of this type exist, but they use the light and volatile oils, and hence are always accompanied with the serious element of danger which prevents their general adoption. What is needed is an internal combustion engine that will consume the heavy non-volatile oils, and certainly the field of usefulness for such an engine is large, even if we do not take into account the item of economy in fuel. Of course this would only remove the smoke from factories; the smoke from private residences could be prevented by the introduction of gas as a fuel.

MARCONI'S TRIUMPH.

On Sunday, December 21, Sig. Marconi announced to the world through the Associated Press that he had succeeded in sending complete messages by wireless telegraphy from his station at Cape Breton to his station in Cornwall, England. This is the text of the dispatch sent by him from Glace Bay, N. S., to the Associated Press: "I beg to inform you for circulation that I have established wireless telegraph communication between Cape Breton and Cornwall, Eng., with complete success. Inauguratory messages, including one from the Governor General of Canada to King Edward, have already been transmitted and forwarded to the Kings of England and Italy. A message to the London *Times* has also been transmitted in the presence of its special correspondent, Dr. Parkin, M. P."

On Sunday, December 21, the station at Table Head was early the scene of suppressed anxiety and controlled nervousness, if we are to believe the descriptions given in the daily press. No doubt there was something of this feeling in the breasts of those who were about to give to the world by a practical test the commercial application of some of the finest results of electrical science. At an early hour Cornwall was called up and the first message was sent. There

was a pause. Did it connect? It did. The answer came. Several other messages were sent.

The announcement of the work accomplished on Sunday came in the nature of a surprise, for Christmas day had been announced as the occasion of the grand opening of the station at Cape Breton. From early morning until about 1 o'clock Marconi remained at the station with doors locked and the gate to the grounds guarded by sentinels. Before leaving the station he sent the message given above.

Following this triumph comes the news of his success at Cape Cod. From South Wellfleet, Mass., we learn that the following message was sent by the Marconi system of wireless telegraph, from that station on January 19 last:

His Majesty, Edward VII., London, England:
In taking advantage of the wonderful triumph of scientific research and ingenuity which has been achieved in perfecting a system of wireless telegraphy, I extend on behalf of the American people most cordial greetings and good wishes to you and to all the people of the British Empire.
THEODORE ROOSEVELT.
Wellfleet, Mass., January 19, 1903.

The King's reply was by cable, as the station at Cornwall, Eng., is not powerful enough to send messages so far. The intention is to bring this station up to proper power and then to open up for business. With a view to doing this intelligently Marconi is at present experimenting on the minimum of power required to transmit a message across the Atlantic. At Glace Bay they use a current of 100,000 volts, while at the Cape Cod station they are using one of only 50,000 volts, not that all this is required to reach Cornwall. It has been announced by the manager of the company that not more than one-sixth of the available power was used in sending the President's message.

The power of the station in England is to be increased, and when that has been done we may expect to see wireless telegraphy enter the commercial world in the struggle for existence. The promise of survival seems to be well founded.

When these stations are completed there will be work for a large staff of expert telegraphers and mechanics, and they expect to be able to transmit messages at the rate of one thousand words per hour.

ALLOYS OF ALUMINUM.

While many uses have been found for the metal aluminum, still its place in construction as a simple metal has not been as extensive as was at first thought it would be. This was due to the fact that

while its specific gravity was only about one-third that of steel, still as a structural material it was about equivalent, weight for weight, to steel, since its tensile strength is only one-third that of steel.

The chief field of utility is in the manufacture of alloys, many of which are now in extensive use. To determine the properties of many of these alloys was the object of a series of experiments undertaken by M. Leon Guillet and described by him in the Bulletin of the Society for the Encouragement of National Industries. Apart from the knowledge of the properties of these alloys, the method of preparing them is of interest.

The oxide of the metal to be alloyed with aluminum was first prepared in the form of a fine powder. This was then mixed with aluminum in fine grains and thoroughly washed with ether to remove all traces of grease. The mixture was then packed in a crucible and ignited by a fuse made of a mixture of aluminum powder and binoxide of barium touched off by a match. When the fused mass had cooled the crucible was broken and a mass of the alloy of the metal reduced from its oxide and a portion of the aluminum was found encased in crystals of corundum. This was then polished and its composition and properties examined.

A few of these may be briefly mentioned. Alloys of aluminum and tungsten containing more than 58 per cent. of the latter proved very hard but also exceedingly brittle. The same was also found true of the alloys with molybdenum, and when they contained high percentages of aluminum there was a tendency to crumble rapidly to a powder. The alloys with tin were malleable and readily crushed, while those with uranium were hard and brittle. With iron and with manganese alloys that were quite malleable were obtained, while with nickel and with cobalt the hardness of the alloy depended on the percentage of these latter metals alloyed with the aluminum—eighty-three per cent. of the former and eighty-seven of the latter giving the hardest alloy.

While this is research work on the part of M. Guillet, it will no doubt have practical results in many lines of industry. The soft alloys may find application for bearings and hard ones for dies for stamping metal so that the dies may be cast and not cut and hardened as is the case now with steel.

TWO FAMOUS EXPERIMENTS REPEATED.

All students of astronomy are familiar with Foucault's famous pendulum experiment to show the rotation of the earth on its axis.

The French astronomer Flammarion has lately repeated this experiment under the same conditions under which it was made fifty years ago. Foucault in 1851 suspended a pendulum made of a heavy weight, supported by a wire, from the interior of the dome of the Pantheon in Paris. The pendulum always keeping the same plane of vibration, the rotation of the earth was indicated by the movement of the pavement beneath with respect to that plane. The experiments of Foucault were interrupted by the political disturbances of the times and were abandoned. In this successful repetition of the experiment the apparent rotation of the plane of vibration of the pendulum, indicating the actual rotation of the earth on its axis, agreed accurately with the computations.

The other experiment which is now repeating is that of determining the density of the earth by means of comparing the vibration of pendulums upon and beneath the surface of the earth. In 1856 Airy tried this experiment at a colliery in Wales. One pendulum swung at the surface of the earth and the other at the bottom of a pit 1,256 feet deep. Great care was taken to obtain accurate results, but still they differed materially from the deductions drawn from the laws of gravitation and did not aid in settling the question. The present repetition of the experiment is under the charge of Major Hayford, of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and is being carried on at the Tamarack Mine, near Calumet, Michigan. It is expected that much more accurate results will be obtained in this repetition of the experiment as the shaft at this mine is 4,550 feet deep. The results of this experiment are awaited with much interest.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

PAUL ALLARD: JULIEN L'APOSTAT. Tome I., pp. iv., 504. Tome II., pp. 376. Tome III., pp. 416. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1903.

M. Allard has linked his name inseparably with the history of early Christianity. No other writer has described so vividly and so attractively what might be called the *relational* life of the early Church—her relations social and political to the Roman Empire, to the institution of slavery and to pagan art. But the work for which he will probably be longest and most gratefully remembered is the five volumes in which he has unfolded the history of the persecutions from their outbreak, to their cessation and the triumph of the Church under Constantine. The honors bestowed by the French Academy on the second portion of this work at its first appearance might well have been extended to its entirety, which, however, for the rest, is crowned in the appreciation and grateful remembrance of all who have read it.

The present work on *Julian the Apostate*, though quite independent on its own account, has its subject matter closely enough connected with the Constantinian triumph to form a consecutive series with the last volume on the final persecution. As indicated in the title above, the work comprises three volumes. Almost half of the first volume is devoted to two pictures, the one of paganism—its teachings and its material and legal situation—the other of society during the fourth century. The latter will be found especially interesting to the student of ecclesiastical history, for its comprehensive presentation of the social and political position of the bishop and clergy of the time. The chapters dealing with the organization of society especially in what concerns the middle and the laboring classes will have a particular suggestiveness to those interested in political economy. Though these pictures have an individual value their bearing on the enigmatical personage of Julian is of main importance, for, as M. Allard well observes, without a precise and detailed apprehension of the epoch in which he lived it is difficult to understand the attempt of Julian to turn back the stream of his time, or to estimate the special character of the ephemeral reaction towards paganism with which his name will remain forever associated. The environment, nevertheless, however carefully estimated, is incapable of explaining Julian. It is in himself in his intellectual beginnings in the secret of his moral character, in the psychology of his history, that one must of course look for the motives of his Satanic endeavor

to resuscitate the dying paganism of his day. Fortunately the materials for mental analysis are ready of access. His writings are full of memories and soul confidences. As with many others whose lives, however active, never completely rid themselves of their dreams. Julian rarely forgets himself. M. Allard has thus been able to draw from his extant works materials for a very complete picture of the mind and heart life of the Apostate and he has wrought them into a tableau of great freshness and beauty. The most honorable and the most successful period of Julian's life was the five or six years spent at the head of the Roman legion in Gaul. Here he drove back the northern barbarian and for the time delayed the invasion that threatened the Empire. The author has given considerable space to these Gallic compaigns, finding it some satisfaction, as he says, to dwell for a while in praise of a man in whom there is so much that calls for condemnation. The first half of the second volume is taken up with the military and political life of Julian as Emperor, and with his specific efforts to reëstablish the pagan cult under the elaborate form or reform into which he endeavored to shape it. A highly interesting section of this part is the account of Julian's own extravagantly superstitious practices, his Sun worship, his stoical asceticism and the like. The latter portion of the volume brings out in some detail the legislative persecution of the Christians, which unlike that of the earlier Cæsars was not bloody or violent in its methods, but subtly civil, striking at the social and educational rights of those who professed Christianity.

The third volume deals with the Anti-Christian efforts of the Apostate in the East, with his polemical writings in the same direction, with his efforts to rebuild the Jewish temple, and with his campaign against the Persians, in which he lost his life. Two portions of this volume have a singular interest and importance: the summary, in which the formative principles and environing circumstances that produced the widely abnormal character of Julian are brought under a comprehensive and highly illuminative survey, and the appendices, in which the sources, pagan and Christian whence his history is derived, are subjected to a critical analysis. For the rest, we can give no fairer estimate of the work as a whole than to say that it reflects throughout the true historical spirit in which it was conceived. The author designed it to be *une oeuvre purement historique*, not *un livre de polemique*. The time has long gone by in which attacks were made on politics by writing books of Roman history. True learning indulges no such phantasies. It seeks solely to throw light upon the past, content when it can to trace the exact sequence of events and portray the true lineaments of a character. The life of Julian contains great and opportune lessons;

their efficacy depends on their being faithfully recounted. It is the highest claim to commendation that M. Allard's work has realized this ideal of the function of history.

"Les Saints:" St. Alphonse de Ligouri. Par *Le Baron J. Angot des Rotours.* Pp. xvii., 183.

Un Pape Français: Urbain II. Par *Lucien Paulot,* de l'Oratoire de S. Philippe de Neri. Pp. xxxvi., 563. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1903.

It is a noteworthy phenomenon that just at this time when the heads of the French government, stimulated by the Satanic machinations of the Lodges, are putting forth their subtlest and strongest efforts to tear out the very roots of Christianity in France, some of the ablest apologetic and expository works on Christian truth ever produced are emanating from the Catholic press in that country. To say nothing of the three great Catholic encyclopædias now under way—the *Dictionaire de la Bible*, the *Dictionaire de l'Archeologie Chrètienne* and the *Dictionaire de Theologie*, each of which is a repertoire of solid learning and deep religiousness of which the scholars and the Church in any land might well be proud—such monuments to the history of early Christianity as are being reared by M. Paul Allard, such a tribute to the mediæval Papacy as has just now been put forth by M. Paulot, such a contribution to sound hagiography as is comprised in the current series *Les Saints*—these, to mention but a few of the more recent, are works that tell more eloquently than words that there must be strong faith and zeal in the mind and heart of a people that desires such food and that can manifest such products of its efficacy. The more so since these works are not polemical nor professedly apologetical; they are not called forth in protest or defense against the persecutor. They are simply expositions of Catholic history, Catholic biography and Catholic heroism. Nor is it without special significance that many of the volumes in the series *Les Saints* are, as is the case with the latest addition thereto —the present volume on St. Alphonsus—the work of laymen. And no less deserving of notice is it that it is precisely those contributions to the series that have been produced by laymen that are in special demand. Thus, for instance, the volumes by M. Henri Joly —who, by the way, is the editor of the series—i. e., those on *Sts. Teresa*, and *Ignatius Loyola*, and that type of subtle spiritual insight, *La Psychologie des Saints* are now in their fourth, fifth and eighth editions respectively. The volume by M. G. Kurth on *St. Clotilde* has reached the seventh edition, that by M. Ad. Hatzfeld, the sixth edition, that by the Prince de Broglie on *St. Vincent de Paul*, the

eighth edition, and so on with others. It is not necessary to direct the readers attention to the interpretation of these phenomena. Of the present volume on *St. Alphonsus*, by the Baron Angot des Roteurs, we deem it no slight praise to say that it deserves its place in the series of which it forms a part. Like its companion volumes it is scholarly without being dry, edifying without exaggeration. It reflects a true sense of proportion. The history of the Saint's exterior activity does not obscure the portrayal of his inner life; nor the details of his asceticism overcrowd the narrative of his deeds of charity and his doctrinal productions. As all the volumes of *Les Saints* are appearing in English, let us hope that this one will find a more competent translator than has fallen to the lot of some of its predecessors.

M. Goyan in his brilliant preface to Père Paulot's biography of Urban II. quotes Hello to the effect that whenever the Occident and the Orient come into contact something mighty begins, and he compares the meeting of the West by the East at the birth of Christianity with that of the East by the West in the days of the mediæval Urban. At the opening of the Christian era the religious idea, he says, widened out the horizon of men; but at that era the political circumstances were favorable; for each time that the frontiers of the Empire receded the human perspectives grew larger. Urban II. took up the work of enlargement, but at the close of the eleventh century the political conditions were hostile. A thousand years before, by some providential design whose mystery St. Augustine's spiritual insight has penetrated, Roman Unity had seconded the Christian ideal of a universal brotherhood. In 1095 feudal dismemberment thwarted and paralyzed that ideal. A thousand years before events wrought for the idea; in 1095 events wrought against it. And yet, thanks to the energy and prestige of Urban, the idea came forth victorious; it siezed upon the conditions, mastered and shaped them. The "City of God" had been relegated to the domain of abstractions. Urban brought it down to earth; transplanted it and thus gave it a reality. In arming itself it grew to the consciousness of its existence and of its rights. Shortly before divided against itself, first by the conflict between Emperor and Pope and then by the crumbling of the fiefs and the quarrels between the cities, it presently became one at the call and under the discipline of the Pope. Lord with lord, village with village, shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart, all moved onwards for God, for Christ, for Christendom. In those ages when the armor seemed at times to make the man, signed with the cross the armor was soon seen to make the Christian. Whatever in the tastes and the customs of men separated them from Christ, thenceforward under the auspices

of the cross brought them nearer to Christ. The voice of a Pope made them companions in arms to teach them to regard one another as brethren and the comradeship of the camp ratified and revealed to them this baptismal fraternity. It is of this unifying man, of the Pontiff who brought the *disjecta membra* of the mediæval social organism under the dominance of a single soul-thought, who gave to the Europe of his day the impulse to the Crusades and thus saved Western civilization from the thraldom of Islamic barbarism, of Urban the worthy successor of Gregory that Père Paulot has written the life and labors in the volume whose title is given above. The work is no panegyric and no polemic. The story of the saintly Pontiff needs but an unvarnished recital to tell what manner of man was Odon and what the world owes to his heroic labors. What these labors were, how manifold and how severe a mere glance at the chronological table (prefixed to the volume), which presents an outline of his work from his entrance as a novice at Cluny in 1076 (he was born in 1042) to his death in the twelfth year of his Pontificate at Rome in 1099. What labors were crowded into that scarcely more than a score of years and particularly into the concluding eleven challenges belief. Père Paulot has given us the record of it all with references to authoritative sources that assure its fidelity to fact, with sympathy for the subject that makes its way to the reader's soul, and with a felicity of expression that sustains one's interest throughout. The work is a solid contribution to the literature of mediæval history, political as well as ecclesiastical.

THE MAKING OF OUR MIDDLE SCHOOLS. An account of the Development of Secondary Education in the United States. 8vo., pp. 541. By *Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D.*, of the University of California. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The educational question is always a burning question. This is true in a special sense in this country where public school education plays such an important part in the training of our boys and girls. Although the system has been in existence a long time, it is far from perfect, and is constantly changing and developing. Hence every contribution to the history of the subject is interesting and valuable. The volume before us is not an exception. The status of our elementary schools is pretty clearly defined. That of the secondary school is far from being settled.

The scope and character of secondary education, roughly defined as "education of a higher stage than that of the elementary school and lower than that of institutions authorized to give academic degrees," occasion much discussion.

For this reason Dr. Brown's contribution to the literature of the subject will be of deep interest to all educators. Among the topics treated are:

"The Grammar Schools of Old England."
"Early Colonial Grammar Schools."
"The English Academies."
"Early State Systems of Secondary Education."
"The Movement Towards Public Control."
"Notes on School Life and Studies."

It can be seen at a glance that these headings cover the field comprehensively; it is impossible in a book of this size to exhaust the subject. It is all interesting, particularly to a pedagogical student, but the readers of the *Quarterly* will be most interested in Chapter XV., entitled "Special Movements," which treats of the efforts of the Catholic Church in secondary education. Special mention is made of Archbishop Carroll, Archbishop Hughes, the Jesuits, the Sisters of Charity (Mother Seton's), Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur, Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Christian Brothers, etc.

The dispassionate record of Catholic educational endeavors is gratifying and quite in contrast with that which characterizes some of the so-called Histories of Education on the same subject.

A brief history of Girard College, Philadelphia, is given on page 541. As bearing on this point it may be stated as an unquestionable historical fact that "Stephen Girard had no intention to found an infidel institution. He intended that his money would go to build a college for the education of the boys of the city, without distinction of creed, and he believed that unless some great protection was placed around the children the institution would in a short time become a huge proselytizing concern."—*Philadelphia Times*, May 27, 1897.

We mention this not because Dr. Brown has made the opposite statement, but because the conclusion has so often been wrongly drawn from the historical premises.

The author shows that he has studied the subject of secondary education well when he says:

"There are many reasons why the question of teachers is more important than the question of studies. And the conviction is now well grounded that teachers of secondary schools as well as teachers of primary schools must be specially trained for their work." (P. 43.)

It is a patent truth, and yet it is often overlooked. The question of the relative importance of the teachers of various grades has often been discussed. The importance of each one over the others has been claimed at different times. The truth is they are all equally

important. It is always a question of the development of a human being, and at every moment that work is sublime and should be effective in time and in eternity.

Chapter XX., "The Outlook," is the concluding chapter and one of the most readable in the book. Evidently Dr. Brown has little sympathy with the doctrine that the State should arrogate to itself the sole work of education. This opinion is quite commonly held by admirers of the common school system, and many of them go so far as to accuse those who don't agree with them of being disloyal to the State. Thinking persons are beginning to see that the public school system is not ideal. The following quotations are indications of the trend of thought on this subject:

"There are many signs of growing interest in religious education. The Roman Catholic Church, after many years of effort in the building up of primary schools on the one hand, and colleges and universities on the other, is now turning its attention to the establishment of high schools. It is not unlikely that a marked increase in such schools may be seen in the near future. Other religious denominations, too, are showing much concern for the establishment of schools for education of a secondary character." (P. 451.)

"*A governmental monopoly is not desirable in any stage of our educational system;* perhaps least of all at the secondary stage."

"The public schools must be non-sectarian for generations to come—probably as long as religious denominations exist. And we make no mistake when we regard such schools as constituting one of the crowning glories of our national life, and a strong support of much that is best in our American civilization. *But private and denominational schools should be welcomed too, and recognized as having a work of their own to do*—as supplementing the noble scheme of education under public management, which has been found so well suited to the general needs of our people."

"We may hope, too, that fraternal relations between teachers of public and private schools will be more generally cultivated in the future than they have been in the past. Each of these great bodies of teachers needs the help of the other to stir it up in the way of making instruction more thoroughly educational, which means more true to life." (P. 453.)

DIE MESSE IM DEUTSCHEN MITTELALTER. Beiträge zur Geschichte des religiösen Volkslebens. Von *Adolph Franz.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1902. Price, $4.15.

In this valuable contribution to liturgical literature, the learned author treats of the place which the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass held

in the life of the people during the Middle Ages, especially in Germany. It is a work of amazing erudition and leaves no phase of the subject unstudied. As the Holy Mass was the chief battleground in the conflict of the Church with heresy in the sixteenth century, it is important to be thoroughly acquainted with the views and opinions which had grown up around it in the course of ages, views and opinions some of which are strange to modern minds. Hence the author has devoted great pains to the study of local customs and traditions relating to the Mass and is by no means reticent in noting any abuse or exaggeration which he has anywhere discovered. If we may be perfmitted a word, we are disposed to suspect that he is sometimes a little too finical in denouncing the "superstitions" of the vulgar. The uneducated people have a way of expressing their sentiments in all matters that affect them deeply, which grates upon the esthetic sense of the over-refined. It has been quite fashionable, since the days of Erasmus, to make merry over the child-like demonstrations of faith of the Catholic populace. But we are far from convinced that the Erasmian philosophy is more acceptable to God than the naïve worship of His ruder children. It may have been superstitious, for all we know (so elastic is the term), in the afflicted woman of the gospels to think that she could be healed by touching the hem of Christ's garment. Yet, healed she was. And if we shrink from calling said woman superstitious, wherefore shall we decry as superstitious the firm belief of Catholics, not only in the Middle Ages but in every age, that a virtue goes forth from the Holy Sacrifice and from everything pertaining to it, altars, chalices, corporals, altar-linens, etc., for the healing of all spiritual and corporal ills? Now more than ever it is necessary to be careful not to suffer ourselves to be influenced by Protestant views in the matter of Catholic customs and ceremonies. Everything in the Church of Christ is sacramental. She herself is the greatest of Sacraments, and sanctifies everything she comes in contact with. Instead of discouraging, we should encourage and guide the devout reverence of the people for things sacred. It is always amusing to notice the solicitude of literary people lest the populace "overdo" things. They rarely give the rude and uneducated credit for much common-sense or keen Catholic instinct. And yet, experience teaches us that these qualities are much oftener found among the lower classes than the higher, especially in matters of religion. It was probably a condescension to Protestant sentiment that induced the author, on page 71, to deplore the effect upon the uneducated of the enthusiastic terms in which mediæval preachers extolled the efficacy of the Mass. "Such language," he tells us, "*might easily* lead astray the laity and the less educated among the clergy, and beget opinions false and injurious

to sound ethical principles. *Of course*, the acquisition of the benefits of the Mass is always made dependent upon the piety of the faithful and also upon their spiritual condition: *but* these qualifications are thrown in the shade by the assurances of the *certainty* of the operations of the Mass. The people, therefore, *might easily* be deluded into the belief that the bare act of hearing the Mass would inevitably issue in their obtaining all its promised and wished-for fruits." The author gives no other warrant for this strange bit of philosophizing, than a snatch from a ribald Lutheran "poem" called *Regnum Papisticum*, where it properly belongs. We can, at all times, safely trust the sagacity of the rudest of the Catholic population to draw a wide distinction between that perfect confidence in the efficacy of divine institutions, which the gospels term faith, and the blind attachment to outward ordinances with which our good people are so flippantly charged by Protestants and by certain of our literary people.

In thus putting in a modest plea for the devotions of the common people, we do not wish to be understood to bear too heavily on the learned book before us. Franz's mistake is one common to his class, and detracts but little from the general excellence of the work. The discriminating reader will find in it much useful information, and will conceive a higher esteem for the deep religiousness of Catholics in pre-Reformation times.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1803. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related by contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and Annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with Historical Introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne, with maps, portraits and other illustrations. 55 vols., large 8vo., cloth, uncut, gilt top. Price, $4.00 net per volume. Vol. I., 1493-1529, pp. 357. The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

If there be one question which more than any other is engaging the attention of the world at the present time it is the Philippine question. This assertion may seem exaggerated at first, but it will bear examination. A few years ago the Philippine Islands were comparitively unknown. They were so completely under the control of Spain, and their contact with the outer world was so very limited except through Spain, that they seldom attracted the attention of other nations. The isolated geographical situation of the islands, and the marked distinctive character of the inhabitants, did not serve to draw them away from home, nor to draw others to them.

Now all this is changed. The entrance of the great United States into possession of the Islands brings them before the world. Up to that time very little was known about them, and very few persons thought of enquiring about them. Now every one is interested and seeking information. As is the case with all new and difficult questions, an enormous amount of ignorance has been masquerading and misleading the public until the most contradictory statements were made and believed, and fair-minded persons almost despaired of ever learning the truth. This condition extended even to government circles, and those who should have understood the Philippine question best in order to be able to act wisely and justly, found themselves drawn in different directions by the contradictory reports of the very persons who were supposed to be well informed, and who, in some instances, had been appointed and equipped to search out the truth. As a result there have been many heart-burnings and many humiliating changes of front.

It is not our purpose to discuss the reasons for all this confusion, and there were many, but to call attention to the condition in order to emphasize the necessity for a remedy. We suppose that this preliminary confusion was inevitable, but it was none the less inexcusable. When we consider the full mass of historical data on the Philippines which was accessible, it is hard to find an excuse for those who neglected to use it. It will not do to say that most of it was far away, and in foreign languages. The importance of the subject demanded every sacrifice.

But now at last we have the truth brought to our very doors. In the magnificent work which the Arthur H. Clark Company, of Cleveland, is bringing from the press the Philippine Islands are being exhaustively treated.

It is not the purpose of the publishers to make out a case for any one. They are gathering together in the most skilful manner and in the most attractive form the full history of the Philippine Islands from 1493 to 1803. They are going to all parts of the world where the data for this history can be found; they are calling to their assistance learned men of every profession and various countries; they have chosen able editors; and they are sparing no pains and no expense to perfect the work.

The result will be monumental. These fifty-five large octavo volumes of at least 425 pages each will probably never be superceded by any other work on the Philippines, and never equaled by a work on any other country of the same size, for there are few countries so rich in historical documents.

The first volume has just appeared and is fully up to the high expectations which the previous announcement begot in the minds

of the reading public. It is also a guarantee of what is to come. Those who are thinking of purchasing the book should remember that only one thousand sets will be printed, and that the widespread interest in the subject is so great as to make the demand prompt and exhaustive.

JOSEPH KARDINAL HERGENRÖTHER'S HANDBUCH DER ALLGEMEINEN KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. Fourth edition, revised by *Dr. J. B. Kirsch*, Professor in the University of Freiburg. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Vol. I., The Church in the Ancient World. Price, $3.60.

We scarcely recognize the dear old form of the late Cardinal in the new dress which has been imposed upon him. We presume it is all right to make him change with the fashions; but it is not easy to reconcile oneself with the way they have in Germany of tampering with the texts of great author. In English countries an author's text is sacred. Whenever it is necessary to bring it up to date, this is done by means of annotations, which are carefully distinguished from the words of the original. Witness Bury's admirable new edition of Gibbon, which is model in every way. In Germany they are not so squeamish. If Pastor sets at work to bring out a new edition of Janssen, he has no hesitation in altering the text to suit his own notions of propriety. When Pastor passes away, some younger professor will treat his works in the same way. In consequence, it is next to impossible, without having at hand the original, as well as the later, editions, to know for certain just what the author himself thought or wrote. This has its disadvantages at times. For it is not at all certain that the original author would acquiesce in many of the changes which his editors consider to be improvements. At any rate it is always necessary, in quoting German works that run through many editions, to use the hyphenated form of Janssen-Pastor, or Hergenröther-Kirsch, or some other similar combination, in which the personality of the original writer becomes almost evanescent. In no instance has such scant courtesy been shown to a distinguished author as in this fourth edition of Hergenröther's valuable history of the Church. We do not say that Dr. Kirsch has not made improvements of various kinds by his summary method of "neu-bearbeiting" the text of his master; but the result reminds one of a sonata by an old master worked over by Liszt, in which only an expert can tell how much is old and how much is new. Well, no doubt, the Cardinal from his throne above will reecho the sentiment of St. Paul: "So that every way Christ be preached, in this also I rejoice." Perish the individual, so that theological science be kept up to the level of *actualité!* Those of us who for twenty years have

been masticating the text of the old edition may continue to do so; the younger generation will begin on Kirsch, to see him eventually give way to some one still more advanced. Thus may "we rise on stepping-stones," etc. In the Catholic Church it is not the individual, but his work, which counts.

We trust that Dr. Kirsch and the other learned professors of Germany will not look on us as Philistines. They will be the first to acknowledge that there is a dignity and an authority attaching to the words chosen by a Hergenröther, a Hefélé, or a Janssen for the expression of their great thoughts which carry much weight and merit to be preserved. Such men are not given to the Church every day; and their disciples who have grown to greatness under their able direction ought to consider it a most sacred duty not to destroy their "epea pteroënta." Who, in fact, will be disposed to submit to the drudgery of authorship, if he foresees that within one short generation his work will be "neu bearbeitet" beyond recognition?

But these are merely the grumblings of an antiquated "laudator temporis acti." If it be definitely settled that the works of our departed great ones are simply dough in the hands of succeeding editors, to be worked over and over again, let us at least hope that this delicate task will always be entrusted to hands as skillful as those of the learned Freiburg professor.

The new edition is much more presentable and convenient than the old, which was extremely unwieldy. As there is no particular reason why the work should be reissued in three huge volumes, why not divide into four or even five?

TRACES OF THE ELDER FAITHS OF IRELAND. A Folklore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. By *W. G. Wood-Martin, M. R. I. A.*, author of "Pagan Ireland," "The Lake Dwellings of Ireland," etc. With numerous illustrations. In two volumes. 8vo., pp. xx.-405 and xvi.-437. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Some idea of the extent of the work which the author mapped out for himself in this book may be formed from the opening words of the Preface which he calls Foreword:

"A sarcastic writer lately advised authors treating on Irish subjects not to omit commencing their essays from the starting point of the Biblical Deluge, so that no fact, direct or collateral, in the matter under consideration might escape notice. Critics do not, as a rule, confine themselves between too narrow limits, but the above recommendation, though good in its way, does not give a wide enough field to work on, at least when Ancient Erin itself is in question. The liberty, therefore, is taken of ignoring the well-meant advice, of

exceeding the prescribed limit, and the subject is opened somewhere in the early Glacial, or perhaps in the Tertiary period. The writer has, in fact, placed himself in the unenviable position of the advocate who, opening his speech with the sentence, 'Before the birth of the world,' was cut short by the judge, who exclaimed: 'Do you not think that we might pass on to the Deluge?' "

The book is almost bewildering in the abundant material collected within the two volumes. Some idea of the wide research which the author brought to the work may be formed from a glance at the bibliography at the end of the second volume which shows nine hundred and eight sources of information. The result is a wonderful collection of legends and stories, traditions and superstitions, running through the centuries with all the variations which time works in such fields. The curious reader may find here the origin of many strange customs and beliefs which have persevered to the present day.

In a work of this kind it is hard to preserve exact order, and the author tells us that his object was to get the many sides of a great subject before the general reading public, with the hope that some great writer will do for Irish archæology what a Prescott and a Motley have done for history at large.

Many readers of the book, while they admire the indefatigeble zeal of the author in gathering his materials together, will not agree with him in his deductions. Here is the keynote to a line of reasoning running all through the work:

"Christianity is generally supposed to have annihilated heathenism in Ireland. In reality it merely smoothed over and swallowed its victim, and the contour of its prey, as in the case of the boa-constrictor, can be distinctly traced under the glistening colors of its beautiful skin. Paganism still exists, it is merely inside instead of outside."

AN APOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. By *Saint Thomas Aquinas.* Edited with an Introduction by the *Very Rev. Father John Procter, S. T. M.*, ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo. Herder, 17 South Broadway. Price, $1.60.

Under this general caption Father Procter has given us an English rendition of two controversial pamphlets, or *Opuscula*, of St. Thomas on the subject of the religious life. The value of the little book of 486 pages is not at all to be measured by its size. It presents the Angelic Doctor at his best. Indeed it may be doubted whether it may not be called the very best and ripest production of his mighty pen. As is generally known, William of St. Amour, so called from

his ancestral estate in Burgundy, was the literary leader of the faction of secular priests at the University of Paris who bitterly resented the occupation of theological chairs by members of the newly founded Mendicant Orders, and the prestige given to these Orders by such teachers as Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventura, with whom the secular teachers were utterly unable to compete. From a squabble over the statutes of the University, the transition was easy to a full-fledged controversy regarding the very constitution of the Mendicant Orders. William's pamphlet *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, in which the Mendicants are berated as "forerunners of antichrist" and as subverters of all ecclesiastical discipline, and the Bishops are exhorted to take stringent measures to defend their episcopal jurisdiction against the extensive privileges and immunities granted to the Friars by the Holy See, is a masterpiece of vituperative rhetoric, worthy of Luther in his palmiest days. But its chief value is that of having induced St. Thomas to indite these two *opuscula*, which will remain, to the end of time, the ablest vindication of the great monastic institution of which he was the most brilliant ornament as well as the staunchest champion. It is characteristic of the Angelic Doctor that, whilst his language is direct and forcible, he is as cool under fire as if he were quetly contemplating the eternal truths in the retirement of his cell. In this respect he is the pride and model of Catholic polemics through all ages. As the question at issue is of perennial interest, we should be pleased to see a copy of this little book in the hands of each of our educated laity.

HERDER'S KONVERSATIONS-LEXICON. Dritte Auflage. Vol. 1. A bis Bonaparte. B. Herder: St. Louis. Net price, $3.50.

We have received, through the courtesy of Mr. Herder, the first volume of the third edition of his magnificent *Konversations-Lexicon*, a Catholic encyclopædia of universal information, forming a fitting complement to his invaluable *Kirchen-Lexicon*, the completion of which last year formed an epoch in the history of Catholic theological progress. Fortified with these two most important publications, we shall feel ourselves enabled to grapple with almost any subject, sacred or profane, which can be of interest to the Catholic scholar.

The existence of such works as these, which are made universally accessible to German Catholics, cannot but cause feelings of shame and envy in the breast of every English speaking child of Holy Church, when he turns to consider the total absence of anything similar in his own language. How often, when we have been asked

by studious Catholics for reliable reading matter on important subjects, have we been forced to return the melancholy answer, that "we know of no adequate or satisfactory work on the subject written in English." How long shall it continue thus? When Protestant houses issue publications in which our Faith receives scant courtesy, we content ourselves with complaints and protestations. In Germany the case is otherwise. There is little need there for any Catholic perusing a Protestant book; for the entire ground of religious belief, and every subject howsoever remotely pertaining thereto, has been thoroughly occupied by Catholic writers, whose labors command the respect of all. We recognize that the publication of a Lexicon like these of Herder is a herculean task; but it can be done; it is imperatively needed; and the attempt ought to be made. We hear many complaints about the literary apathy of our Catholic people; but one chief reason of their reading so little may be that they have really so little to read that appeals to their needs. With the foundation everywhere of free libraries, the buying of books by individuals is growing less every day. Now Catholic books of reference ought to be found in every public library; but they must first of all be written. *Exoriare aliquis!*

THE LIFE OF SAINT PHILIP NERI, Apostle of Rome and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory. From the Italian of *Father Bacci*, of the Roman Oratory. New and revised edition. Edited by *Frederick Ignatius Antrobus*, of the London Oratory. Two volumes in large octavo. B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. Price, $3.75 net.

The name of St. Philip has been endeared to all English-speaking Catholics by the loving devotion of his two illustrious sons, Cardinal Newman and Father Faber, who had so deeply imbibed his spirit that in their persons the kindly Saint seemed once more to be walking the earth. The main events of his life have been known to us for many years through the masterly work of his great Italian son, Cardinal Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua. But admirable as is Capecelatro's biography, there is still ample room for the original life of the Saint from which he drew his inspiration, the book in which all the great Oratorians were fond of studying the saintly character of their spiritual father. The naiveté with which Bacci compiled his life of St. Philip, his old-fashioned method dwelling rather upon virtues and miracles and ecstasies, than upon outward incidents, presents the Saint from a different standpoint from that taken by the modern biographer. The impression produced by a perusal of Capecelatro's work is that of the importance of St. Philip in the public life of the Church, his influence in the highest ecclesi-

astical circles, etc. This phase of the Saint's activity is only secondary with good old Father Bacci, who devotes just one-fourth of his space to the narrative of the Saint's history, the remaining three-fourths being expended upon his internal life. The latter method of describing a saint may not be as interesting as the former to the generality of readers, but it brings into a proper perspective the things which Saints deem to be by far the most vital and enduring. Let each of these great works remain side by side, in order that the lovely character of St. Philip may be ever better known and studied.

We congratulate Mr. Herder on the typographical beauty of the volumes. The half-tone illustrations are unusually good.

THE HARMONY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By *Herman J. Heuser*, Overbrook Seminary. 12mo., pp. 247, with frontispiece. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We read these Conferences as they appeared in *The Dolphin*, 1902, over the name Fra Arminio, and we have read them again in book form, with increased pleasure, and we hope with increased profit. They are charming, using that work in its true and best sense. We cannot improve on the following description written by an appreciative and discerning pen:

"This book presents a new departure in the literature of spiritual treatises, being, as it were, a popular manual of religious perfection —a sort of 'Spiritual Life Made Easy,' its hardest lessons made winsome and acceptable.

"The work is a little gospel of cheerfulness, for religious primarily, written in an engaging literary style, under the form of an allegory. The author likens a religious institute to a grand organ, whose separate keys are the individual members of the community in which they live. The organist is Jesus Christ Himself, the Divine Director of the harmony of the religious life. If this harmony is to be perfect, the human elements of the spiritual instrument must be in accord with one another—attentive to the Master's directions and responsive to His behests. Following out the figure, the music of the Christian life is the glad, willing service of God and our neighbor required of every man and woman, whether in religion or not.

"The allegory is sustained throughout and admirably adapted to carry home convincingly the practical lessons of caution and counsel suggested by the author's sympathetic insight into the spirit of the real religious. The recesses of the mind and heart hold fewer secrets from Father Heuser than from many even of our most successful problem-novelists. His humor is of the sort that leaves a smile instead of a sting, and his pen is kind even when it is keenest in tracing shams and self-deceit."

A Round Table of the Representative Catholic German Novelists. With Portraits, Biographical Sketches and Bibliography. 12mo., pp. 235. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Twelve stories by twelve representative German writers, six men and six women, done into excellent English, give us an entertaining volume of Catholic fiction. The stories are all good, not only from a literary point of view, but, which is more important, from a moral point of view also.

It is very refreshing and consoling to meet a book of this kind at a time when fiction has become so false, so inane, so immoral, as to be worse than useless. Parents should welcome books like this most heartily. They should place them in the family library, on the table, in the hands of their children. A fearful responsibility rests on those who have the direction of children and young persons in regard to their reading. It is a responsibility which cannot be avoided. Many persons have not time to read and decide in every instance on the merits of a book; others have not the ability; but all can safely trust publishers like Benziger Brothers, who publish only what has been read and approved by the proper officials of the Church. Their efforts to disseminate Catholic literature deserve all the encouragement that can be given to them. In the volume before us they not only give to English reading Catholics a collection of good stories, but they also produce a manual of German fictional literature, by giving us biographies and bibliographies and portraits of twelve German writers. May such work prosper.

Manual of Christian Doctrine, Comprising Dogma, Moral and Worship. By a Seminary Professor. 12mo., pp. xiv., 587. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

"This book is intended as a manual of religious instruction not only in the Novitiates and Scholasticates of teaching Congregations, but also in the classes of High Schools, Academies and Colleges. It is an abridgement of the three volumes of Dogmas, Moral, and Worship respectively, that constitute the Intermediate Course of Religious Instruction. In it will be found the whole substance of these volumes without any sacrifice of clearness, precision, or method. The teacher will find in the Intermediate Course, not only the matter for that explanation and development which should always accompany the use of a text for students, but also synoptic tables for the purposes of review. Yet this single volume is sufficiently complete to give the pupil that knowledge of religion, which in the words of St. Paul, is according to doctrine: that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers."

These words from the Preface of the book before us so clearly

state its nature and purpose, that nothing need be added. The larger work in three volumes has been received with words of the highest praise, and this summary is worthy of its predecessor. It is a complete catechism for high schools and academies.

TWENTY-FIVE PLAIN CATHOLIC SERMONS ON USEFUL SUBJECTS, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By *Father Clement Holland.* 12mo., pp. 422. Second Series. London: Thomas Baker.

The first series of Father Holland's sermons appeared about a year ago. The same plan is followed in the new series. Each sermon is preceded by a synopsis which is closely followed in the development of the discourse. This plan will help very much those who want to preach these sermons. We hope that the number is very small. It should be confined to two classes of persons: those who are unable to write their own sermons, and those who have not time to do so. We are not willing to admit that any priest is unable to write his sermons, and are very much tempted to deny that any priest has not time. We use the word write in the wide sense, meaning to prepare properly. This preparation should include prayer, meditation, reading, study, and composition, in full if possible, but at least in outline. Every priest can do this, and the failure to do it is a bad sign—if it exist. It indicates that we are not the educated, thoughtful, spiritual men that we are supposed to be, and we cannot admit that. We sincerely hope that preachers, and especially young preachers, will not be tempted by the multiplicity of sermon books that are pouring from the press, to neglect this vitally important duty of their ministry.

DE PERFECTIONE VITAE SPIRITUALIS, *R. P. Antonii Le Gaudier, S. J.* Editio recens emendata cura et studio P. A. M. Micheletti, S. J. Tom. I. Augustae Taurinorum (Turin), Typogr. P. Marietti. Londinum apud Thomas Baker, 1903. Pp. xiv., 604.

The first edition of Père Le Gaudier's treatise on the perfection of the spiritual life appeared in 1629. The reprint of that edition, published in 1855, having been exhausted, the curator of the present edition has brought out the work in a more attractive and convenient form. It is hardly necessary to say anything here in commendation of the work. Its place is in the front rank of treatises on ascetical theology. Père Le Gaudier was a master of the spiritual life; deeply versed in its theory he exemplified it in his life. Solidity, breadth, spiritual insight, unction and clarity of exposition are everywhere manifest in his writings. The present volume treats of the nature,

degrees and practice of perfection. A subsequent volume will embody the remaining three parts of the entire work—on the means, instruments and pursuit of perfection—together with two opuscula on the love and imitation of our Lord. Though primarily written for the spiritual training of the Jesuit, its principles, method and practices cover the universal science and art of the spiritual life, and every guide of the human soul will find in it abundant light and

---

Books Received.

COMFORT FOR THE FAINT-HEARTED. By *Ludovicus Blosius, O. S. B.* Translated from the Latin by *Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P.* St. Louis: Herder. Price, 75 cents.

THE RELIGIOUS STATE, THE EPISCOPATE AND PRIESTLY OFFICE. By *Saint Thomas Aquinas.* A translation of the Minor Work of the Saint on *The Perfection of the Spiritual Life.* Edited, with prefatory notice, by the *Very Rev. Father Procter, S. T. M.*, ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, $1.00.

REVEREND MOTHER M. XAVIER WARDE, Foundress of the Order of Mercy in the United States. The Story of her Life with brief sketches of her Foundations. By the *Sisters of Mercy*, Mount St. Mary's, Manchester, New Hampshire. Preface by Right Rev. Denis M. Bradley, D. D. Boston: Marlier & Company. Price, $1.25.

A DEVOUT COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. Drawn chiefly from the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, of the Order of St. Dominic. By *Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P.* St. Louis: Herder. Price net, $1.00.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCES. Second Series, 1900-1901. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* St. Louis, Mo.: Herder. Price, $1.35.

THE TRUTH OF THE PAPAL CLAIMS. By *Raphael Merry del Val, D. D.*, Archbishop of Nicaea. A course of five lectures delivered in Rome in 1902 in reply to a book published by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, D. D., English Chaplain in Rome. St. Louis: Herder. Price net, $1.00.

FORTY-FIVE SERMONS, written to meet Objections of the Present Day. By *Rev. James McKernan*, of the Diocese of Trenton, N. J. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Pustet & Co.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Romae-Tornaci. Typis Societ. S. Ioannis Ev. 48mo., 1903. Milwaukee: Wiltzius & Co.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS ECCLESIASTICI. Quas in Usum Scholarum scripsit *Jos. Laurentius, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, net $3.50.

INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS EYSTETTENSIS. Editio quinta Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 620 pages. Price, $2.85.

TRACTATUS DE DEO-HOMINE, SIVE DE VERBO INCARNATO. Auctore *Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Two volumes. I., Christologia. Price, $3.60. II., Mariologia et Soteriologia. Price, $4.25. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis.

HISTORIC HIGHWAYS OF AMERICA. The Exploration, Conquest and Development of America, based upon its Highways of War, Commerce and Immigration. By *Archer Butler Hulbert.* Vol. 3, Washington's Road (Nemacolin's Path). The First Chapter of the Old French War, pp. 215. Vol. 4, Braddock's Road and Three Rrelative Papers, pp. 213, with maps and illustrations. The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE ad usum confessariorum compositi et soluti: ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J. Vol. I. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $2.40 net.

NOTICE.

Just as we go to press, we receive from Mr. B. Herder, St. Louis, the fifth and sixth volumes of the English translation of Jannsen's *History of the German People*, of which an extensive review will appear in our July number.